

THE Catholic Mind

VOL. XLVIII

AUGUST, 1950

NO. 1052

Role of the Catholic Press

MOST REV. MICHAEL J. READY

An address delivered by the Episcopal Chairman of the Press Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, May 25, 1950, at the 40th Annual Convention of the Catholic Press Association of the United States, held in Rochester, N. Y.

ALL interested in the welfare of the Church and in particular in the effectiveness of the Catholic press have, from time to time, considered proposals to change the usual weekly set-up of our press to the daily field. Likely the subject will be debated in this convention and further practical considerations studied to that end. Certainly the extensive and intensive growth of our press has been aided greatly by the Schools of Journalism which have regarded the special needs of the Catholic press. Their growth encourages us to hope that our papers and magazines will receive an ever-increasing supply of capable journalists and executives, who in turn will enhance the value of our press generally in these critical times. I trust that experienced publishers

and editors will emphasize in this convention, for the knowledge of the Bishops generally, the ways and means to employ increasing numbers of well-trained journalists at salaries and working conditions which will attract and hold laymen and laywomen worthy of the press apostolate. The press is a field in which capable and zealous laymen can contribute a distinctive service to the Church and to our country. We should be more concerned in opening such opportunities to our laity.

It seems to me, too, that there should be much more thinking, planning and discussion on the various problems of producing a strong and better press. There are unquestioned values in a diocesan press. But I would like to have the studious opin-

ions of publishers and editors on the subject of a state-wide or regional Catholic press. Certainly there are tremendous advantages in a press that carries prestige of a circulation, which, in lieu of episcopal promotion, usually means a well-edited, well-printed and well-promoted paper or magazine. All these questions demand the continued consideration of those responsible for the Catholic press.

Some of us may be old enough to recall the pungent verses of "Ironquill," a topical versifier whose real name was E. F. Ware, and who departed this life in the year 1911. He might be described, in terms of the current hour, as a columnist of sorts. Nowadays our columnists seldom attempt verse. They are not inclined to furnish us paragraphs suffused with the high spirit of poesy. They are all business and rugged realism. The man called Ironquill was more versatile and I mean to perpetrate no pun in thus linking versatility and verses. One of his rhymed remarks may be adapted and adopted for our thought on this present occasion. He wrote:

No town can hope prosperity and
trade

Unless the Press shall vigorously
aid.

We may twist this rhyme a little to our own uses and say, speaking of the human aspect of our apostolate:

The Church shall find her des-
tined progress stayed

Unless her Press shall vigorously
aid.

Here, in a single phrase, we have the whole point and purpose of the Catholic press. It exists to render "vigorous aid" to the Church of God in her work for souls. In the missionary effort of the Church, which seeks to spread the Kingdom; in the consolidating effort, which strives to develop and perpetuate the family solidarity of the faithful; in the educational effort, which endeavors to establish and maintain a well-instructed and appreciative laity; in the devotional effort, which is intended to advance every child of the Church in virtue and grace—in all these phases or departments of the activity of the Church, the Catholic press is to render "vigorous aid." It is the glory of our press that it has been, in the face of almost endless difficulties, steadfast and effective in serving its great purpose.

MAGNIFICENT WORK

We do not claim that the work of our press has been or is perfect. The Catholic press, though divinely helped, is a human work. As such it is incapable of sheer perfection. We have deficiencies to fill up. It is profitable to think and to speak of such things at our conventions. For we do not come together in annual meeting for the purpose of buttering one another over with compliments or basking in the glow of mutual praise.

We seek furtherance and improvement in that where we may show lack or fault. We are steeled to hear our shortcomings mentioned without being depressed by a sense of injury.

The Catholic press has done, and is now doing, a magnificent work. There can be no question of its vigor. There can only be question of its application in the way of true aid to the cause of Christ and His Church. To make our work constantly helpful as well as vigorous, we must ever preserve a careful moderation of judgment, a swiftly responsive sensitiveness to the mind of the Church, an undeviating devotion to justice, a complete and joyous dedication to perfect charity.

Around us the secular press sounds a steadily blaring note. It is often shrill with apprehension; often discordant with unjustified accusation; often uncharitably prompt with unwarranted condemnation. It is the secular press which, in large measure, conditions the atmosphere in which Catholic editor and newsman do their work. And it is a very difficult thing for anyone to live and breathe in an atmosphere without taking in its influence, even when that influence carries a contagion. It is hard for Catholic men of the press to maintain

Christian serenity, coolness of judgment and moderation of utterance in an atmosphere full of agitation, headlong decision and extravagant statement.

It must be said at once that our press is worthy of unbounded praise for its superbly sustained dignity and poise in the face of malicious attack from without. Indeed, it is a phenomenon unique and unparalleled in the history of journalism that the Catholic press has never lowered itself to the level of the attacks made upon all that it vigorously aids. False and vicious charges are constantly hurled against the Church, her Hierarchy, her policies, national and international. Our press meets this unremitting vilification with almost miraculous self-possession. It grows neither angry nor abusive. It does not resort to name-calling. It does not grow shrill in the heart-breaking and unending task of refuting manifest error and pointing out manifest truth to eyes that will not see. The Catholic press magnificently keeps its dignity. This is a dignity without condescension or contempt, even under attacks so vile as to deserve only contempt. The majesty of unruffled patience and enduring charity which marks our queenly Mother, the

Church, is splendidly reflected in the press that serves her.

In view of that exceptional record of restraint against our enemies I find it disconcerting to note the coolness and at times the hostility of our press towards our friends. I speak of men in public life who through long years have proved themselves sincere and devoted sons of the Church—faithful, self-sacrificing and tireless in promoting and defending the essential interests of God and Country.

The reason for editorial coolness today may be the circumstance that these men have failed to leap nimbly on the bandwagon of popular condemnation. They have been hesitant to fix the odium of shamefully traitorous activities upon persons accused, but not actually convicted, of base crimes. These men might have long records in defense of the rights of our religious schools, in condemnation of Communism and all subversive movements, in the promotion of programs and legislation for insuring peace in the world, for better housing, health and working conditions, which in turn would aid in providing better homes for decent, happy family life. These men deserve the encouragement and notice of our press as well as those who lately and hysterically identify themselves as the sole defenders of the nation. Perhaps we may trace in this the influence of an undisciplined and feverish secular press. We may ask whether the vigor

here exercised is actually in aid of justice and charity.

Today our major defensive effort is directed against the terrifying menace of Communism. Our vigor in this effort is beyond praise. That the Catholic press should tirelessly sustain this vigorous activity is an absolute requirement. Yet, even as we condemn Communism, we may sometimes fail to notice the real source of Communistic vitality and gain. We may miss the spawning-grounds of Communism, or pass without full notice the conditions which "feed its monstrous growth."

COMMUNISM-MALARIA

Let me approach this point in a somewhat round-about manner by what will appear a digression. Not many years have passed since the first successful efforts were made to clear out the scourge of malaria from semi-tropical countries and islands. For a long time, people had sought remedy for the disease and for some medical preventive to armor the populace against infection. Finally, one wiser than his fellows directed his attention to the breeding grounds of the carriers of the disease. There, as he rightly insisted, was the place for effective battle against the continually recurring epidemic. The carriers of malaria are mosquitoes which multiply and develop in foul and stagnant pools. Once these pools were purified or drained away, the

disease was checked, and eventually it was brought under control.

Now, if we consider Communism, as it exists and increases among us, to be a kind of malaria; if we regard party-members and fellow-travellers as carriers of the disease, we shall see the force of my seeming digression. Our press has been diligently administering doses of quinine to cure the Communism-malaria; that is, the press has been faithful in pointing out the intrinsic evil of Communism, in directly counteracting its influence, in warning the unwary against infection. The press must continue with this dosage. But it must also, perhaps even more urgently, direct attention and effort to the draining of evil pools, the purifying of evil grounds, the clarifying of evil air, in which the carriers of Communism flourish and multiply.

SECULARISM

The breeding-spot of Communism is secularism. Secularism in its essentials is a compound or combination of two things. These are, first, indifference to God and religion; and second, disregard for the moral law, particularly in its requirements touching the begetting and conserving of human life and the respecting of human dignity. In the atmosphere of secularism, Communism flourishes. In the breeding-ground of secularism, the carriers of Communism—party-members, fellow-travellers, parlor

pinks, touts for totalitarianism—increase and multiply and threaten to fill the earth and subdue it.

If, then, the secularist atmosphere could be cleared; if its evil ground or foul pool could be freed of contamination, Communism would, of necessity, wither and die. And here, as I judge the matter, lies the great challenge for the Catholic press in this troubled hour. Continuing the direct attack upon Communism, our press is now to strive mightily to conquer the secularist spirit, the secularist attitude to life and duty and dignity, which is widespread in our country today, even, in some degree, among the less instructed and less devout of our own Catholic people.

In the secularist atmosphere there is no defense against Communist infection. A man of secularist stripe believes, in some fashion, in God; he is likely to think kindly of religion, and to have admiration for moral virtue. But he is altogether shallow. He is not deeply enough concerned with God or religion or virtue to find in these realities the strong guidance of his way of life. He is not horrified at the very suggestion of atheism or a war against religion. Indeed, suave argument may quickly win him to the view that economic advance and world-wide prosperity will be the result of general atheism and irreligion. His condition of fundamental indifference towards the essential issues of life—that is, his secularism—makes

him a ready victim for the Communist appeal. He stands near the stagnant pool where the carriers of Communism live and feed; this is his own place, the home of secularism. He is readily infected by the carriers of Communism, and, in his turn, he carries the infection to others. To this type of person—whose name is legion—the Catholic press must bring seasonable aid.

To this end—a positive Catholic attack upon secularism—the press must labor, in season and out of season, to make mankind aware of the true character and quality of Christ's Church. The divine establishment of the Church, the need of knowing and entering the one true institution set up for the soul's salvation, the call to the home of man's spirit, dulled by the deadly routine of material interests and employments and sunk in the indifferentism of the secularist world—these are the essential and unremitting tasks which the Catholic press must prosecute with renewed vigor.

EDUCATION AND RELIGIOUS TRUTH

From this point—the unique necessity of the true Church—the press must go on to insist, and keep tirelessly insisting, upon the fact that education is unworthy of its name if it be not solidly based upon religious truth. The great Catholic press must teach, again and again and always, that parents have a natural right, an inviolable right, to have their children

trained religiously, and not subjected to godlessness in school instruction and atmosphere; that parents must not be penalized by the State for insisting on their plain right in this regard.

Again, serving its positive attack on secularism, the breeding-ground of Communism, the press of the Catholic Church must endlessly insist upon the truth that public morality must be founded on religion; that it cannot endure if its basis is nothing more than a code of penal laws. The world may be slow to learn this lesson from our press, but it cannot be slower than it has been in learning the lesson from its own disastrous experience. But, however slow the pupil, the teacher's task is steadily before him. Our press must not allow a sense of futility to still its unceasing voice in proclaiming the way to the establishment of public morality founded upon religious truth.

We seldom see, these days, the glowing name of Social Justice, which was once frequently mentioned in our press. We have the continuing duty of stressing this necessary virtue. A war-prosperity which seemed to set right a great many economic wrongs may have lulled our press into silence upon a point which at this hour needs more stressing than ever before. Our press must take up again the cry of Social Justice, and must ceaselessly indicate the way to the achieving of a righteous and peaceful society such

as only the principles of Social Justice can insure.

In all the points I have recounted here we find occasion for new dedication and new effort. I do not, however, mean to suggest that our press has been remiss in its steady and vigorous efforts to aid the Church in her holy mission. Our press has been, and remains, the sound mentor and monitor, striving always to develop virtue in human lives and devotion in human souls.

VIGOR WITH WISDOM

"Vigorous aid" is still our watchword. Not vigor alone, but vigor used with wisdom, with enlightenment, so that it is a flawless help in the cause of Christ. Therefore, we must hold our poise and kindly dignity, as we do in meeting foul attack, when we apply our vigorous aid to the positive work of destroying error and establishing truth. We shall show nothing of the manner or method of this currently shouting world. We shall not adopt the ranting style of the "hucksters" who will have the thing called "Publicity" at any price, even at the price of surrendered dignity and decency and truth. We are not shrewd merchants with wares to sell, with articles to be somehow cleared off at a profit by dinnin their real or imagined perfections into the ears of prospective buyers. Our press must preserve its essential virtues: moderation in judgment, sensitivity to the

mind of the Church, dedication to justice and to charity. These we shall hold in the supernaturally serene knowledge that our task is to foster and proclaim on earth the one Eternal Truth the world requires.

We shall perform our task in the spirit of reverence, a wondrous virtue which is the guardian of all the rest. And we shall see that this reverence is manifested in all our work: in our manner of expression in our editorials, our news-stories, our advertising. In passing, I may suggest that reverence is not served by the type of advertisement which summons youth to seminary or novitiate in as crude a fashion as that which urges readers to try a certain brand of soap or cigarette. Reverence is not served by the advertising of "shares in countless Masses" and in endless "spiritual benefits" for the sacrifice of twenty-five cents a year in aid to some alleged religious enterprise. Reverence is not served by showing an image of St. Barbara, and even of the Sacred Heart, in an old-fashioned "witch barometer," and advertising the monstrosity in a full-page color-ad in Catholic magazines. Let us remember that where reverence is injured, the cause of secularism is mightily served. Where reverence is served, the cause of Christ is served.

Our press is a great press. It is doing splendid work for God and souls. May God bless it and prosper it. May He keep us all in watchful-

ness and prayer, conscious of our proper service, aware of its fineness and dignity, ever prepared to battle valiantly with the spirit of the world which Our Lord Himself called the principality of Satan. May He dower us in these Pentecostal days with the gifts of alertness, moderation, pru-

dence, justice, charity and deep reverence. With these to guide and inspire our efforts, the Catholic press shall not fail to render to the cause of Christ and Christ's Church the service of a ministry and apostleship, which shall merit the glowing description of truly "vigorous aid."



England Loses the Faith

"There are, then, it seems to us, three dates of supreme importance in the religious changes in England, *viz.* 1534, 1549 and 1552. These years witnessed the three principal events which, when combined, effected the complete separation of England from Catholic unity. In 1534 England was weaned from Catholic obedience by the Act of Supremacy, which repudiated the authority of the Pope and substituted for it the authority of the king; in 1549 England was weaned from the language of the Church by the passing into law of a Prayer Book which substituted English for Latin. And in 1552 the last link with Catholicity was severed when England was weaned from Catholic doctrine by the Second Prayer Book, the uncompromising Protestantism of which even High Churchmen find it impossible to deny."—*W. J. Hegarty in The IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD, November, 1949.*



Too Much Theorizing

"If we wish to know whether in the beginning of the human race there were such institutions as the family and private property; if we wish to know what relationships existed between husband and wife, parents and children; if we wish to know if there existed civil government, morals, religion and training of the young in morality, then we must ask primitive peoples, and not just 'spin' theories out of our imagination, as evolutionists have done and are still doing. Evolutionists assume that in the beginning there existed only the very simple, the ugly, the undifferentiated, the imperfect; and that only after a long period of evolving did the complex, the organized, the beautiful and the perfect come into existence. This is an arbitrary explanation 'spun' by fantasy and not founded on scientific investigation."—*Martin Gusinde, S.V.D. in The AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, June, 1950.*

Kiev Under Bolshevik Rule

*Reprinted from THE UKRAINIAN BULLETIN**

THE *Ukrainian News*, appearing in the city of Neu-Ulm, U. S. Zone of Germany, has published an eye-witness account by a German prisoner of war who only recently returned from Ukraine. He was kept in a POW camp near Darnitsia, a suburb of the Ukrainian capital, and had ample opportunity to observe how the Ukrainian people live and dwell under the Communist dictatorship. His account goes as follows:

The population of Kiev-Darnitsia and all the people within a fifty-kilometer radius live in abject poverty. They have neither food, clothing nor living quarters, for the Soviet Government has not built any new buildings since the war's end. In a few stores, there is some clothing, but it is so expensive that a workingman or a peasant cannot possibly afford necessary clothing. Prices of food are so high that a worker who earns 300 rubles a month cannot at all support a family consisting of himself and his wife.

A black market is flourishing in Kiev, and those people ("speculators") engaged in black-market operations have more money than any other group. At the railroad stations and on the streets one sees many beggars who sing mournful songs for their alms. Among the beggars there are many crippled by the last war and decorated for actions on the fronts.

The city of Kiev is slowly being rebuilt. The railroad bridge which was blown up by the Soviet troops before the Germans took the city, is yet to be repaired. A wooden bridge speedily built by the German engineers is still in use. The whole population, including the children, is working on the construction of roads in Ukraine. The new cadres of engineers and builders, recruited exclusively from the members of the Communist Party and the Comsomol, are not at all efficient in reconstruction; therefore, the same work is not infrequently done over.

In the villages and cities of Ukraine there function numerous MVD organs. Hungry and ragged people cannot even discuss their miserable conditions, because anyone who dares complain about the unhappy

* 50 Church St., New York 7, N. Y., June 1, 1949.

life is immediately taken away by the MVD. Those who are arrested by the secret police are sent to Siberia in such secrecy that even the members of the family are not notified.

In Kiev and Darnitsia there are hundreds of MVD agents and militiamen who control the documents of every citizen.

Those who were repatriated from Western Europe as displaced persons are sent to concentration camps in Ukraine or Siberia, where many have already died from hunger and hard slave labor. They all curse those who were responsible for sending them back to the Soviet "paradise." They would return to Western Germany any time, if an opportunity should present itself.

Life in the USSR is so poor and the Soviet propaganda about the "happy life" under Stalin so patently false that the people have become completely indifferent and apathetic with regard to whatever the Government says.

Despite and because of these dreadful conditions and the ever-present terror of the MVD, today there are many partisan groups in Ukraine which combat the Russian occupation. They operate, according to the people of Ukraine, in the vicinities of Chernihiv, Vinnitsia, Rivne and in the Carpathian Mountains.

In Kiev there are cases of banditry; there is no light on the streets at night and there is constant thievery by a dissatisfied population. The people are favorably disposed toward the partisans and believe them to be their liberators and brave fighters for justice and the better life.



Obstacle to Atomic Control

"No plan which does not provide for complete ownership, control and inspection of atomic enterprises the world over and for generations to come can be safely accepted by the people of the United States.

"No nation can be assumed to be governed by the moral standards to which we subscribe if it is a nation that, as a matter of doctrine, rejects religion, denies the authority of moral law, and has a record of action to demonstrate that it treats solemn covenants as matters of temporary convenience."—*Lewis L. Strauss, former member of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mar. 23, 1950.*

Attitude Toward Sex

DEMETRIUS MANOUSOS, O.F.M.

*Address delivered at the National Catholic Conference on Family Life,
Detroit, Mich., March 14, 1950.*

CATHOLIC youth is on a bridge today. The abyss of impurity lies below them. It is the duty of parents and teachers to keep them away from the edge. But let us never forget that the bridge has two sides. Most priests could tell you of at least one or two cases where parent or priest, teaching sister or teaching brother have pushed a boy or girl over one side of the bridge in their effort to keep him or her from falling off the other.

If there is a conspiracy against chastity today, as there undoubtedly is, our strongest armor against it is a correct attitude toward sex, the attitude of the Church, the attitude of God's saints, the attitude of the Blessed Virgin Mary herself.

Since earliest Christian times the Blessed Virgin Mary has been considered the model of chastity particularly for young people, but certainly for everyone.

She was conceived without sin, a virgin without stain, the purest of all creatures. She is the ideal of Christian womanhood, model for virgins and mothers. Christian men have always looked up to her as their Heavenly Queen, whom they hoped

to find mirrored in some way in the earthly queen of their hearts.

If Mary is beyond doubt the highest model for our ideal of chastity, I think it is only sensible to go to her to find the model of our attitude toward sex. We can hold our way of thinking and acting in this matter up against her way of thinking and acting. So far as our attitude differs, it is distorted and, therefore, dangerous.

Fortunately for our purposes, the longest and most important conversation of the Blessed Virgin on record has much to teach us about sex. You know that conversation well. It is the most momentous conversation in man's history.

The Angel Gabriel came to Nazareth to tell Mary that she would conceive in her womb and bring forth a son, and the Virgin asked: "How shall this happen since I do not know man?" There was more talk and explanation, the great acceptance, and then the news of Saint Elizabeth's pregnancy—"she who was called barren is now in her sixth month."

There are several things to be noticed in that momentous conversation —first, the proximity of sex to the

central mystery of Christianity, the Incarnation, (it was a woman's power of conceiving and bearing a son that was to bring the Incarnate God into the world); secondly, the Blessed Virgin's anxiety to be pure and the consideration of God Himself to protect her Virginity; finally, the fact that both the Angel and the Virgin spoke freely and without squeamishness about sex.

The first two points are commonly recognized, but I wonder how often Catholics think of the third. Mary was a very young girl (most authors believe she was in her early teens). Yet she does not blush with confusion, or squirm with false shame because someone says to her: "Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb." Mary had blushed when the Angel praised her, calling her blessed among women. But now she shows no confusion, only puzzlement, and she asks the Angel a frank and natural question: "How shall this happen, since I do not know man?"

She was not, of course, speaking of knowledge in the usual sense. She was acquainted with not a few men, Joseph especially, since she was espoused to him. She was using the idiom of her time to say: "But how shall I bear a son, for I do not have sexual relations with any man?"

This teen-age girl knew the facts of life, and was not ashamed to talk of them when necessary. She was not a prude or a Puritan. Sex to her was

not something to be whispered about, something wicked or shameful. She knew the value of virginity, but that appreciation did not have false roots in a distorted attitude toward sex. The Blessed Virgin Mary was the purest and holiest woman that ever lived. The Seat of Wisdom had the right attitude, the only correct attitude toward one of the most beautiful and delicate of all God's gifts.

PERVERTED ATTITUDES

If the conspiracy against chastity finds a weakness in modern Catholic Americans it is, after universal concupiscence, the false attitude of many Catholics toward sex.

Consider our Catholic youth, the young people growing from childhood into puberty, at a time when the attitude toward sex is largely molded and set. If they are in the usual environment, they find themselves caught between two opposed attitudes, both perverted and hence evil. I call these attitudes the "smirk-smirk" point of view and the "hush-hush" point of view regarding sex.

The smirk-smirk viewpoint is largely the result of the secularist paganism that is flourishing all around us. It is a sign of our decadent civilization, and is very similar to the attitude prevalent in the Roman Empire during the centuries preceding its collapse.

Divorce, adultery, fornication, birth-control, perversion, effeminacy

are not sins peculiar to our age. They have flourished, it seems, whenever a civilization has sunk into its death agony and is about to go to pieces. That is not an original observation. Non-Catholic historians and philosophers have remarked it.

Non-Catholic philosophers of history have also remarked that we seem to be on the verge of the twilight age marking the sunset of our past civilization and the dawn of a new one. That should not discourage us, for the new civilization dawning may well be a Christian renaissance equal to none the world has yet seen.

What is vital to us is that we arm our souls against the dangers prevalent in our era. A secularist attitude toward sex is one of them.

That people should tour the country teaching onanism and preaching sin, that the law should allow adultery and almost a promiscuous exchange of married partners, that newspapers should give such a tremendous amount of space to publicizing the circumstances of sexual sins indicate more than a purely secularistic attitude toward sex. They point to a diabolism that any truly Christian mind must sense immediately.

We have here not just a purely natural view of sex. We have not a view which merely lacks a realization of the supernatural significance of sex. We have rather something evil, sinister, diabolical. I call it the

smirk-smirk point of view. For all its talk of looking at sex without inhibitions as a normal animal function in the human male or female, it does not do so. It slinks and squirms and smirks with perverted delight. No cow or horse or dog ever approached sex as does the modern pagan.

Such a perversion, of course, must be expected when secularism combines with concupiscence. What we must consider is that our young people are growing up in such an environment. All of us are influenced by it. If you live in a skunks' lair, you will pick up some of the odor no matter how clean your personal habits may be.

OUR LADY

The Blessed Virgin Mary lived in an age quite as bad as our own. She, too, was surrounded by a perverted attitude toward sex. Not many miles from her home the king lived with his brother's wife and thought nothing of having his step-daughter do a strip-tease before his guests. Historians comment on the increase of divorce, abortion and birth-control in Rome and throughout the Empire at that period. Even the Pharisees were looking for ways to condone divorce.

Perhaps it was in protest against or in reparation for all this that Mary desired a life of consecrated virginity. We know she had a tremendous love for purity. But we must not forget that she never lost

her reverence for sex, nor did she adopt a false, prudish horror of it. "Elizabeth thy kinswoman also has conceived a son in her old age, and she who was called barren is now in her sixth month," said the Angel. And the young girl, holiest of virgins, sped to the hill country to assist her pregnant relative.

To point out that the Virgin was not a prude is far from joining forces with the advocates of public sex-instruction who would tear down the barriers of Christian modesty. They may believe themselves advocates of naturalism or honesty. Actually they are feeding the smirk-smirk attitude, for they have forgotten the power of concupiscence.

Reverence for sex demands an extra reticence, a natural caution, for concupiscence has peculiarly weakened us in regards to this delicate gift. Perhaps it is because the first woman abused her love for the first man by tempting him that the scars of original sin fell so close to sex, the instrument of love between man and woman.

Concupiscence does not make sex less beautiful or holy. It merely makes it more delicate and more needful of reverence. Christian modesty is the tabernacle we build around the natural sacrament of love because, since the Fall, there are thieves in the house.

Mindful of this necessary modesty, I emphasize the Blessed Virgin's lack

of prudishness, because a growing Catholic boy or girl today is often caught in a fearful position. On the one side is the smirk-smirk viewpoint of the pagans, on the other side the hush-hush viewpoint of many parents and teachers. The result is a horrible distortion of the adolescent's attitude. Sex becomes beautiful and desirable only so far as it is evil and covered with the sugar of forbidden fruit. One of the strongest natural appetites becomes associated irreversibly with wickedness. Marriage itself takes on the aspect of a contract legalizing a shameful desire.

HUSH-HUSH

God forgive parents, teachers, or priests who have so trampled this flower of natural creation. The millstone about their necks is as great as that about the necks of the pagan preachers of perversion.

This hush-hush viewpoint, of course, is not admitted by the majority of those who are influenced by it. It goes under the name of prudence, asceticism, caution, even a love for chastity. It springs partly from a reaction to the smirk-smirk viewpoint all around us, but largely it is a residue from the heresies of the past, false doctrines that have been uprooted in substance but have left their odor behind.

The hush-hush attitude toward sex entered American Catholic thinking through two channels — directly

through the Jansenistic influence on the French and English-speaking clergy, indirectly through the environment of American Puritanism.

Both these channels, I believe, can be traced back to the doctrine of Manichaeism, which last reared its ugly head in France as the Albigensian heresy of the thirteenth century. One of its pivotal doctrines is that the flesh and everything connected with sex and marriage is evil. Albigensianism was crushed in France, but its odor never died. It rose up again in sixteenth-century Calvinism and yet again in seventeenth-century Jansenism.

Through Calvinism it affected Victorian England and Puritan America. Through Jansenism it influenced English and Irish Catholicism.

A CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE

We must work now at developing a truly Christian attitude toward sex, an attitude untainted by the Jansenism that considers sex evil or the secularism that considers sin natural. We want neither smirk-smirk nor hush-hush. We want the attitude of the Virgin Mary.

The attitude of the Virgin is, of course, the attitude of her Son, and that attitude is evident when we consider that Christ made marriage a sacrament.

Matrimony is a singular sacrament, different from all the rest. In the other sacraments God took some-

thing out of Heaven, at it were, and brought it down to earth. But in matrimony He took something from the earth and lifted it up to Heaven.

Unlike the other sacraments, matrimony existed from the creation of Adam and Eve, not as a sacrament but as a natural union of love between man and woman. In all its natural aspects it was exactly the same as it is today. When Christ took marriage and made it a sacrament, He did not change it; He left it just as it was, the highest expression of human love. But He elevated it. He took the human love in it and made that love not only human but also supernatural.

Thus marriage is the only natural institution which God has seen fit to raise to the height of a sacrament. The sex contract, giving two people irrevocable sexual dominion over each other, is the only human contract that of itself gives supernatural grace.

Saint Paul tells us that the sexual union of man and woman in marriage is a figure of the union of Christ and His Church. That is, indeed, high praise, and yet the figure of sexual love as the human type of mystical love of God appears again and again in the writing inspired by the Holy Spirit. *The Canticle of Canticles* is one long poem inspired by that analogy. When the prophets wanted to speak of unfaithfulness to God, they described it in the sexual

terms of fornication and adultery. Saint Thomas Aquinas claims that the sexual love of man and woman was intended as a symbol of the Incarnation from the moment that God made Adam and Eve male and female.

To look at sex as something evil, therefore, is tantamount to heresy. Sex is something beautiful, something exquisitely holy. It is just this holiness that makes impurity so horrible. To abuse or pervert this holy, beautiful gift of God is almost a formal sacrilege. A Christian soul shrinks from it, hates it, fears it. As an esthetically sensitive soul would shrink from the mutilation of a beautiful sculpture, so the soul of a Christian shrinks from the abuse of the power of sex—but never from sex itself.

Youth must be taught to treasure this physical power within them, to realize that the inclination is a beautiful thing so far as it is destined to its holy purpose, the bringing of new

souls into the world, the fostering of nuptial love, the symbolizing of the union of Christ and the Church.

We can consecrate that sacred power within us by the holocaust of virginity or the partial oblation of matrimony. But we can also desecrate its delicate beauty by the misuse of sin.

We pray that the young men and women of today and tomorrow will grow up with the realization that sex is a beautiful flame they carry in the lantern of their bodies. It is to be cherished and protected and kept low when not in use. If they play with it or expose it unnecessarily, they will burn themselves, and it can start a conflagration that will ruin everything in their lives. But if they cherish it with reverence and care, they can preserve it for the day when they may either dedicate it as a sacrifice to God or open the shutters of the lantern and use it to light their way to the soul of another in the beautiful palace of matrimony.



Freedom and Security

"There can be no 'domestic tranquility' where freedom of opportunity and security of the person are denied any group or portion of our citizens for any reason whatever. The curtailment of equal enjoyment of 'the blessings of liberty' by every citizen through any procedure tolerated within our national policy is as grave a threat to the nation's stability as it would be to have the slavery of dictatorship forcibly imposed upon us by a tyrannical aggressor from without."—*Secretary of the Navy, Francis P. Matthews, University of Scranton, June 4, 1950.*

The Public Employment Service

JOSEPH P. FITZPATRICK, S.J.
Fordham University

Keynote address delivered before the annual convention of the Pennsylvania Chapter, International Association of Public Employment Services, Philadelphia, September 23, 1949.

I WISH to thank you very sincerely for inviting me to honor you with a few words about the objectives and ideals of the Public Employment Service. Actually you need no words or speeches to honor you. You are honored in a much more real way by the satisfaction and security of thousands of girls who sit before typewriters or business machines, or thousands of men who do everything from storing cases in a warehouse to drafting the plans of a building, but who have a source of livelihood, a sense of satisfaction in doing something useful, a sense of pride in self-reliance because of the employment which your service has given them. This is honor far more eloquent than words. But since, on occasions like this, we like to have the value of our work translated into language, I am grateful that you should have chosen me to do it.

Briefly, I shall say this: you are engaged in a vitally important service to your fellow men; the service which you give may prove to be important for the protection of their

future freedom; but you must be very careful lest you run the risk of enslaving men by the very service which you render.

When I started to think how I would describe your place in a democracy, I could not help recalling an illustration that was often used by Colonel Moore, one of the first members of the Labor Board of New York State, whenever he spoke about employment. He used to say:

"Four hundred years ago, if you put a final question to a workingman and said: 'You can have either your job or your right eye,' the workingman would have laughed at you and answered: 'Do you think I'm a fool? Take my job.' But if you asked a workingman the same question today, he would be likely to answer: 'If it's a question between my job and my right eye, you had better take my right eye. I can get along without an eye. I cannot get along without a job.'"

Therefore if you ask me, "What is the place of the Public Employment Service in a Democracy?" what more eloquent answer could I give than this: "You try to get people into jobs. You try to get the right

people into the right jobs. And when they are out of a job, you administer the insurance that protects them against want." In a day when we would pay great honor to a surgeon who could replace an eye that we had lost, should we not be ready to pay great honor also to a public servant who could replace a job that we had lost?

As the public servants of a democratic people, therefore, providing the cushion against poverty or getting the right people into the right employment, you are dealing with a very critical area of modern life. There is no need to impress that upon you. You see it every day, sometimes in the long lines of waiting men and women stretching half way down the block outside your office. You hear it every day, perhaps in the nervous or frightened words of the workman twisting his cap in his hands as he tells you: "There ain't much I can do, but you can help me, can't you?" In the anxious struggle of people for the security of a job, you are very much in the front lines.

Secondly, you not only deal with a critical area of modern life; the service you render may be important in preserving for many people a freedom which is threatened. You are aware of the great political problem of our times: the willingness of men to sacrifice freedom for security. Rather have sufficient bread than the

free ballot; rather be told what to do by a tyrant as long as it means a steady week's pay. To put the same problem the other way round, control over a man's job is control over a man's life. It is the lever with which you can pry a man loose sometimes from loyalty to his most sincere beliefs. It is a lesson that the Communist, the racketeer, the unscrupulous employer have learned well and practised effectively.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE

Therefore, the more freedom you can give a man in selecting his job, the more freedom you give to his whole life. And here is where your service can be of great importance. The proper administration of unemployment compensation gives the citizen a little lee-way, a chance to wait a little while at least, to be a little "choosy." But what is more, your employment service enables a man to stand, not at the hiring gate of one plant, but at the hiring gates of a thousand; you introduce him, not to one office in one city, but to a hundred offices in a hundred cities. He may be a laborer living in South Philadelphia, he may be a machinist in Chester or a pattern-maker in Reading. Alone he may never leave his neighborhood to look for a job, but you take him to the whole city, the whole State, in some cases to large sections of the world. No longer is he caught within the tight

confines of a few city blocks or the narrow limits of a one-shop town, to be forced to take "the only thing a man can get if he expects to eat." He has a certain sense of liberty, of independence. He can afford now to be free. Nothing has ever before given the worker such wide horizons, such expansive opportunities in a secure, intelligent way as that given by the Employment Service.

Furthermore, in a time of crisis, your position becomes even more important. You are the only agency which possesses the one vital instrument with which to face a modern crisis: the instrument of adequate and timely information. You have access to the facts; you "know the score." Through the Labor Department statistics and your own employment and unemployment records you follow the trends day by day, week by week; you see the sore spots almost before they appear; you see the areas of need and opportunity. It is only with such knowledge that men today can cope with the vast problem of continuous employment. We do not know yet to what extent this knowledge protected us from a serious slump during the recession of the past summer. It played a significant part. For if a doctor intends to prevent a serious illness, he must be able to detect infection the moment that it starts. And if a state intends to prevent the spread of social illness, it must be able to spot a so-

cial weakness the moment that it starts. This is what the Employment Service is eminently equipped to do. You know the pulse of the patient almost every hour.

"WELFARE STATE"

I would like to delay here for a moment to cast this picture against the background of a very important development of our day. We are witnessing the coming of what is called the "Welfare State." A welfare state is one that considers itself the agent of its people to see that all the resources of a nation are developed and used for the benefit of the people. Whatever service the people really need, the state will provide for them.

I think you all know what led to this trend. People had become convinced that they were not getting their proper share of the fruits of modern industry; they were convinced that industry, left to itself, could not provide them with the security they needed, with the benefits they had to have as the basis for a decent livelihood. This condition has prompted some states to take over private industries. I do not criticize a state for doing this. If such extreme measures are necessary to provide for the welfare of a people, a state has not only the right but the obligation to do so.

But must a state go to these extremes? Is it not possible for a state

to serve its citizens without changing so seriously our present forms of democratic life? Let us look at the employment service for a minute. In providing a service for the citizen, you are very much in the spirit of the time. You serve the people of the nation, not by taking over the coal mines or the steel mills, but by putting the work of private business into the hands of private workers without making either one of them part of the government. You have seen no need to make yourselves the hiring hall for nationalized industries. Therefore, if your own service and others like it can continue to work effectively, perhaps our Government will be able to show the world that it can provide all the services of the welfare state, can make itself the servant of private industry and private workers without becoming the employer of both of them.

DANGERS ARE PRESENT

These are the great benefits of an employment service, and I know you realize that I am touching upon only a few. However, there are not only benefits to an employment service. There are dangers as well. We are living in a world in which men will give up freedom to gain security. We are also living in a world in which governments are enslaving people under the pretense of serving them. Control over the job, as I have said, can be a very dangerous thing.

And control of strategic information can be dangerous also. It tempts a person or an agency or a government to manipulate the lives of the people it can control; to take advantage of a citizen's weakness or dependence; to look upon the human person as a cog in a vast social machine who must be maneuvered around to keep the machine working smoothly and at top speed.

There is the terrible danger that a man may become not a person but a thing; not the jovial and courageous Mike Murphy who used to play shortstop on the High School team and worked at night to help support his mother, who married the pretty red-head who lived over the corner store; but he may become social security number 7.452.769—a succession of punches on a record card, hustled along and sorted and packed by the contacts of an IBM, a dull and drab statistic, full-fledged citizen of the systematic state. Bad enough to see the individual lost in the vast mechanical world of a factory. It is doubly bad to see the same individual lost in a vast, impersonal state. This is the problem of our times: to save the dignity and self respect of the human person from the domination of a state which may become all powerful because its services to its citizens may become all necessary.

In one of your books describing your services, you have a very in-

teresting and suggestive illustration. It pictures a long, broad highway extending out into the endless distance. Out in that distance, a thin veil partly conceals a face. Through a small uplifted corner of the veil a sharp, impersonal piercing eye looks down while there, in the middle of the highway, naked and alone, stands a human being. Up on the side, extending out and above the human being, are the Greek letters and the mathematical symbols of an equation.

That's a very interesting picture to think about. I would advise you to take a look at it when you are back in the office. It can mean a great many different things. It can mean what it is intended to mean: that modern science can give a man remarkable knowledge about himself; can spare him the agony of stumbling from job to job in life; can give him a wonderful mastery over his talents and ability, and send him forth with confidence to make his living. It can mean that.

But it can mean something else also. It can mean that the all-seeing eye of the all-powerful state has stripped all the mysteries and ideals away from a man's life; that it has reduced the sanctity of his person to the symbols of a mathematical equation; that it has left him naked and alone, helpless and unprotected against the power which maneuvers him.

The one tremendous service that man needs today is not simply to be given employment or compensation, but to be given employment or compensation as a human person, to be treated as one who means something in himself, as the possessor of sacred rights which neither state nor fellow citizen can tamper with. All the powers of his soul clamor for the recognition that he is unique. And with reason. You can see expressions of this even in a man's body. Examine the finger-print records of the FBI. Millions upon millions of finger prints are filed there, but no two of them are ever alike. No two ever shall be alike. No matter how many faces the keenest artists have examined, each face has been distinct. These are but the marks in a man's body of the special care God had for him when He created him as a human person. And man demands that his dignity as a person be acknowledged.

This is the great service that you can do for him. For this service cannot be provided by any law, or by the proper operation of a government bureau. The only one who can really give that service is another human person, the one who, as a public servant, stands between the state and the citizen whom the state is trying to serve. What is more, you are in a particularly good spot to do it. You frequently meet the citizen when he is greatly in need, some-

times near despair. In this position every courtesy looks twice as large, and every bit of recognition grows a hundred times in greatness. You can give a man every job in the State of Pennsylvania; if you degrade a man in doing so, you have only injured him. Give a man this reverence as a person and, though you have given him nothing else, you have served him well.

The talk that I am giving, you have called a keynote address. Surely you all know what a keynote is. It is the note that sets the tone for all the other notes on a musical scale. Once it is struck, it gathers a host of other notes, gives them perfect order and proportion and, out of confused succession of sounds, it casts them into the glorious harmony of beautiful music.

Therefore, what should your keynote be? It should be the idea that sets the tone for all your work in the employment service. It should be the idea that gathers all the actions of your day, the hours you spend fingering the endless cards of a record file, the courtesy by which you save

the self-respect of a discouraged workman, the patient words you speak to impatient people. The keynote gathers all these scattered fragments of the task which you perform, throws them into perfect order and proportion, produces a harmony of human action which inspires.

That keynote is your purpose and conviction that you serve the sons of God for the sake of God. If Our Lord were teaching us today the works of mercy which He once mentioned in detail—to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to heal the sick—I am sure there is one more specific case that He would add: “to give assistance or work to the unemployed.” Let not the maze of organization, the reams of paper, banks of business machines, channels of command blind you to the real meaning, the keynote of the service which you give. To bring to men, in the name of God, the assistance or work which they so vitally need, that is your function in a democracy. And as long as that function remains in a democracy, democracy will remain among us.



“The heart of a child is like a mill; it is always grinding something. If you pour good wheat into a mill, you will get good flour; if you pour into it third-grade or decaying wheat, you will get third-grade or spoilt flour; if you do not give any grist, the mill stone will rub and wear itself away.”
—From DON BOSCO, June, 1950.

The Age of the Caudillos

JOHN FRANCIS BANNON, S.J.

*Reprinted from THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN**

LATIN-AMERICAN historiography is a relatively young science and as such has its large share of problems. The historians of Europe have been at the game of telling the story of their nations for a long time and have been able to sift the mass of facts and events, movements and personalities, until it is relatively easy to cull the most important and meaningful for incorporation into a workable and justifiable synthesis. The historiography of the United States, too, is beginning to show certain basic patterns. Not so that of Latin America, especially when one seeks to bring something of unity into the twenty individual national stories. The problems of selection and grouping, of segregation and synthesis still baffle the historians of Latin America. It is only by continual experimentation and exchange of ideas that a solution or solutions can be found. With such a thought in mind the following observations are offered.

Air-tight chronological divisions in the story of human development are impossible to set. Yet, for convenience sake, it is often helpful to break down the story of a life or of humanity itself into ages or periods.

The element of flexibility must always be present when there is question of a group. However, if there are certain influences which affect all members of the group at a given time, one has at least one term for a division. He is hardly fortunate enough to have both. The attainment of nationhood by the Latin Americas toward the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century can be taken as a starting point—granting that one or other achieved independence at a much later date, as Cuba and Panama. Where to end the “early national period” for Latin America as a whole is more difficult to determine. And what to call the age is of a kind. The absence of uniform development within the twenty Latin Americas renders the first of these trying, but one might be reasonably safe in setting the early years of the twentieth century as another term. Next, therefore, is the task of finding a name for this time span.

The designation, “The Age of the Caudillos,” may not be the best or the most proper, but does emphasize a phenomenon of those last three-quarters of the nineteenth century in the Latin Americas which is very

* 221 North Grand Blvd., St. Louis 3, Mo., May, 1950.

characteristic, namely *caudillismo*. This may seem to overplay the political aspect of the period; but such is not necessarily so. The *caudillos*, to a very considerable degree, represent the whole society which saw their rise and their predominance, a society trying desperately to find itself and either powerless to prevent or, perhaps, half willing to accept a radical solution. The suggested name for the era need not imply that *caudillismo* ceased to exist as a phenomenon in Latin America by the early years of the twentieth century. This would be a false conclusion in the face of evidence of more contemporary years. But by that time the peculiar society of the *caudillos* had changed considerably and was moving toward a new maturity, another stage in the process of development. Almost all of the Latin Americas had outgrown their "teen-age" restlessness and instability and were taking on some, at least, of the characteristics of early young manhood.

The last three-quarters of the nineteenth century constitute an age of adjustment in the lives of the Latin Americas. After a closely guarded childhood, they suddenly break away and seek to stand on their own feet in a world which itself is going through a period of tremendous change, occasioned by the two great revolutions which came into Western life in the latter half of the eighteenth century—the Intellectual Rev-

olution and the Industrial Revolution. These two create the atmosphere in which the Latin Americas must live and survive. During this period under discussion the first of these, the Intellectual Revolution, had the greatest influence on Latin American development; in the last half-century the impact of the second has been a greater factor.

LIBERTY, FREEDOM, EQUALITY

The so-called "Age of the *Caudillos*" is, then, a period in which young nations are seeking to make their lives conform to a new pattern of society in which liberty, freedom and equality are the guiding principles. Due to circumstances of their colonial background, the Latin Americas were ill-prepared for the sudden revolution in their lives, their institutions, their philosophies and their general attitudes. Intellectually convinced of the validity of the new ideas, they struck out for themselves and were able to make good their independence from mother-countries. But independence soon proved to be more easily won than mastered.

Liberty, freedom, equality, and the rest had been very attractive in the writings of the men who had proposed a "New Regime." Unfortunately, it was only thus that the Latin Americas knew such things—from books. They had had no House of Burgesses, no General Court, no As-

sembly in which to train their political talents during colonial centuries. It was a far cry from the salon of the literati to the floor of a chamber or a congress. There had been little or no equality in a society in which the Indian was a ward of the Crown, the Negro a slave, and the vast majority of white men excluded from preëminence in public life by the geographic accident of their birthplace. Latin Americans had rarely, if ever, been asked for their opinion as to policies. These last came to them ready-made, from autocratic crowns or equally powerful royal agencies, and all that was asked of the colonials was unquestioning obedience. Free expression of one's opinion might well have been construed as treason, and as a result few Latins in the colonial centuries took the risk. Toleration of dissident religious beliefs had not been necessary, since none other than Roman Catholicism had been allowed to enter the Ibero-American empires. Opportunity had been a closely guarded gift of the Crown, to be granted or withheld as the royal will felt itself best served.

Hence, it was a strange new experience which faced the Latin Americas in the late 1820's. They had, so to speak, a blueprint for their building, which they could read more or less well, but no experienced contractors, no skilled laborers, and few materials for the actual construction. Anglo-American brethren had been more

fortunate and much better equipped, and by temperament and outlook they were better fitted to meet the challenging requirements of building a modern democratic state and of living, on their own, in a modern democratic society.

CONSERVATIVES AND LIBERALS

Attitudes toward the new ideas soon divided Latin Americans into two rival camps or political parties, Conservatives and Liberals. The first were not the inveterate enemies of the new ideas that their European namesakes were. There were many things about the Old Regime which American Conservatives were more than willing to discard. The *criollos* had never been enthusiastic for an autocracy which held them down, which had closed to them positions of trust and power, which had imposed heavy taxes on their fortunes. They certainly did not want to "conserve" such things. Their *mestizo* allies in the fight for independence and now co-sharers of the responsibilities of leadership were of the same mind. Many American churchmen were perfectly content to welcome a regime which would put an end to the *Patronato Real*, that the Church might regain her independence. It was the rare Latin-American Conservative who would have yearned for the "old days."

As a group, however, these Conservatives—landlords, men of wealth,

men of proud American names—wanted a society in which liberty and equality would be theirs to enjoy, but theirs, also, to control and to disburse as it served their advantage. On the other hand, they were not averse to strong rule, provided they or one of theirs exercised it, and, once more, provided that it redounded to their advantage. Equality was a fine, a noble ideal, for themselves to make them the equal of any *peninsular*, but they had little trouble in convincing themselves that it might be dangerous to allow the common people to rise to the same level with themselves. It would almost surely prove both socially ruinous and economically devastating, were the Indian to be loosed from his peonage and the Negro slave from his bondage. The men of the Church were not always opposed to the broad interpretation of these new ideas, as the *criollo* and *mestizo* "aristocracy" regularly was, but they did find ample reason to contest the meaning which the Liberal read into liberty, equality, progress, and the rest. Thus, they were inclined to string along with the "aristocracy." Therefore, a powerful segment of white and near-white leadership would adjust slowly to the intellectual phase of "modernization."

The Liberals—professional men, university men, business men—were crusading idealists. They, like the Conservatives but for different rea-

sons, were equally ill-prepared to put their ideals into practice. They accepted the new ideas at face value, in their most literal sense, and without question; they sought to enforce them in government and in society without reservation and without restriction and, most of all, without delay. In theory, they did not shy away from liberty. Rousseau had told them that all men are naturally good, that maladjustments and social inequities are traceable to society, not to man's nature; he had promised that, once man had regained his freedom from the incubus of traditional restrictions, man's innate goodness would once again show forth, and the world would be a paradise in which natural rights would be respected and Reason would have a chance to rule without interference. They believed Rousseau and those other men of the eighteenth century who had given the recipe for progress.

HATRED OF THE CHURCH

The Liberals inherited the burning hate of these men for the Old Regime and the Church, the great obstacles to "progress." Nor did the Liberals retreat from the concept of equality in its most literal sense. Indian, even Negro, like the white man, was created equal, had the same natural rights, deserved the same opportunities. If he was ignorant, the Liberal would educate him; if he was poor, the Liberal would endow him,

to be sure at the expense of the rich; if he was underprivileged, the Liberal would right the balance. The Church, outmoded and proved worthless, obscurantist, obstructionist by the "champions of progress," had to be curtailed in her power, her influence over simple minds broken, her wealth put to productive purposes, and her churchmen kept within "modern" bounds. Few Liberals would have wished to destroy her altogether. She was, after all, part of a past, part of the Latin nationalism; properly controlled she might still serve useful purposes, as a policeman of morals and conduct for the masses, but even for this she had to be taught to know and to keep her place.

IDEOLOGICAL SETTING

Under the domination now of one and now of the other of these two definitely extremist camps the Latin Americas were to grow up. Unfortunately, by comparison with Anglo-American fellows to the north, the Latin American did not have a frontier, or at least did not use the ones available. There the Conservative might have learned that background and name avail very little against an untamed wilderness; there he might have learned not simply the theoretic advantage but the imperious need of cooperating with his fellows to insure success. There the Liberal might have been forced to desert his

doctrinaire idealism and descend to reality; there he might have learned to respect even those whose ideas he did not share. Instead Conservatives and Liberals battled toe-to-toe, yielding not an inch, saw no good reason why they should. They furnish the ideological setting for the Age of Caudillos—political, social, economic, religious. Each country of Latin America knew them both.

The problem of governmental organization revolved around two theories of internal make-up, federalism and unitarism. History offered examples, and each pattern had its proponents. To some leaders the United States brand of federalism was the answer; others felt that the highly centralized France of Napoleonic days offered a sounder type of framework. In between, though of no great consequence, were those who would have been interested in reproducing the loose sort of confederation such as had prevailed in the United States under the Articles of Confederation.

Centralization met two formidable opponents, quite apart from whatever rivalry may have existed on purely political grounds. The first was Nature herself, which, in South America particularly, seems to have decreed in favor of decentralization, long before man came with his theories. Geography, for example, created three Chiles and as many Colombias. In almost all the countries there was at very least the duality of tide-

water and highland. In others, when mountains did not make for division, the location of ports and harbors did. Alongside this physiographic factor must be placed a second force, namely, the tendency toward localism and provincial autonomy brought to the New World by the Iberian pioneers. The homeland whence they came was a patchwork of kingdoms and of provinces within kingdoms, some even with a language of their own, which had yielded most grudgingly to the unifying efforts of Ferdinand and Isabella and of the Habsburgs of the sixteenth century. When to geography and habit were added political and economic advantages for interested groups, the organizational problem facing the young Latin Americas became an element of distressing instability. Argentina knew it in its most exaggerated form, where for long years "port" and "provinces" carried on a debilitating civil war. Its traces are found in the history of Colombia, of Chile, and elsewhere.

SOUGHT PERSONAL ADVANTAGE

The implementation of political authority was another universal problem. When the democracy which the "founding fathers" lauded and wrote into their constitutions proved unworkable and premature, the strong men took over. Most of the *caudillos* sought, first, last and always, their own personal advantage and that of a tight little group of followers. Most

of them were military men, and their power was built on force. They came by violence; they ruled by violence; they disappeared by violence. Most of them were despots, and only a very few of the "benevolent" variety. In a society where the citizenry was sadly untrained, inadequately experienced and psychologically unready for the duties and responsibilities of self-government, the strong man, no matter how out of place in a democracy, was often practically the only means of obtaining even temporary order and tranquillity. However, the despotic rule of the *caudillo* was not exactly the correct political atmosphere in which to breed the understanding and practice of liberty and equality and all those other things which were to go into the making of the New Regime.

The process of adapting to "modern" civilization met with another complex difficulty in the area of Church-State relationships. Conflict at this point is quite universal throughout the Latin Americas in the "Age of the Caudillos." Nothing similar has occurred in Anglo-America to furnish the basis for understanding by the device of comparison, no matter how faulty. Therefore, here the *norteamericano* must start from scratch in his attempt to appreciate what is involved in the problem as it has confronted the Latin Americas.

The conflict between Church and State in Latin America is complicated

by two basic factors: the traditionally strong position of the Church in colonial society and the extremism which only too often characterizes the Latin Americans as men. During colonial times there was a very close union between Church and State both in the mother-countries and in their overseas empires. This fact naturally contributed toward strengthening the position of the Church in all the Latin-American provinces. The fact, too, that, due to Habsburg choice, the Catholic Church existed in the Spanish Indies without a rival certainly did not lessen her influence. This last she did not lose in the change from colony to nation, for the early constitutions of most of the new republics named Roman Catholicism as the state religion, often to the exclusion of all other creeds.

PATRONATO REAL

Hence, here was an institution which had deep roots in the historical past of all the young commonwealths, an institution which was powerful also because of its nature, its organization and its wealth. The second factor mentioned above, extremism in the Latin character, needs little explanation, since it is clear that in the event of conflict there would be little hope of a peaceful settlement between parties by resort to compromise. Each side felt that all right and all justice were inextricably bound up in its cause and claims.

The powers which the Spanish Crown exercised over ecclesiastical personnel and ecclesiastical funds, as granted to the monarchs under the *Patronato Real*, became one of the first bones of contention between Church and State in the national period. Through the colonial years folk had come to take it for granted that the State exercised these powers by a right inherent in political authority. As a result, in many minds there was no question but that on the achievement of independence the rulers of the new commonwealths were to have the same right of nomination to high ecclesiastical positions, the same right to approve or disapprove papal bulls and decrees, the same right to control Church finances, and all the other powers formally exercised by the king. On this point the Church maintained a contrary view. According to the papacy and the non-regalist churchmen in Latin America these rights and powers had been delegated to the Spanish and Portuguese Crowns by grant and, therefore, were not of the inherent nature of political authority. Consequently, if and when the Church chose to revoke the delegation of powers, she might do so, and the State had no legitimate cause to object and no recourse against such a decision. Following the achievement of independence by the Latin-American provinces the Church chose so to act, striking thus for her own independence from lay influence. The

State, understandably if mistakenly, challenged this liberating action of the papacy.

The somewhat anomalous situation created by the *Patronato Real*, which in later colonial times had become increasingly embarrassing, the Church considered as thoroughly incongruous and improper under the new regimes which independence brought into control in the several states. Even though the patriots and their immediate successors made a profession of Catholicism, wrote the Church into a favored position in their constitutions, and so forth, the Church still did not consider them nor their representative bodies as the most competent or the most fitting agencies for naming the Latin-American hierarchy (archbishops, bishops and ranking clerical officials). She was only too well aware that many of the national leaders were deeply infected with the ideas and spirit of the Enlightenment, which movement was hardly friendly to the Church or to the values and beliefs for which she stood. Many of them were Masonic in sympathy if not always in actual affiliation, and Latin Masonry was certainly not working for the upbuilding of the Church. She deemed it imprudent, at very least, and, at its worst, suicidal to entrust the fate of the Church to such statesmen. Even granting that they would handle their power with the general care and loyalty with which royal patrons had used it, there

was no assurance that their successors would be so highminded.

Further grounds of friction developed as the Liberals came into power in various of the nations and sought to enforce certain interpretations of liberty, freedom and equality. The Church, on principle, was opposed to such Liberal measures as the legalization of divorce, the secularization of education, the sequestration of Church property. Though as a rule the Church fared better in her relations with the Conservative State, still, even there, conflict was not wholly unusual. Thus, during the "Age of the Caudillos" the Latin Americans had to find a basis of reconciliation between two institutions which they definitely wished to retain in their society, the Catholic Church and the Modern State.

ECONOMICS

In the field of economics the Latin Americas had to face two serious problems and had to attempt to resolve them in the terms of "modern" practice. One had to do with the organization of national economies, the other with the distribution of wealth. Both involved difficult situations inherited from colonial times; the two were in many respects closely bound up with each other. Upon the ability to meet the one and the other depended "progress," as the Modern Age understood it. Actual survival in a highly competitive world was often

the stake for which the young nations were gambling.

One-product economies had been the standard colonial pattern in most instances. The mother-country had seen little reason for economic differentiation within a given area. Why should the energy and manpower of a province whose subsoil was rich in the precious ores be dissipated in other than mining enterprise? The empire was large enough that a food-producing province could be developed which would feed not only itself but also its mining neighbor. Specialization fitted the Mercantilist scheme very satisfactorily. This may or may not have been the wisest approach, but it must be admitted that it worked fairly well as long as the continent was integrated into an imperial economic unit. When, however, this larger unit broke into a dozen-and-one-half independent national entities, colonial practice became a distinct liability to the nations in question.

No one of the young nations had the experience requisite for a quick shift in the direction of differentiation; no one possessed the native or domestic capital to subsidize such an expansion, even granting that the courage, energy and vision to undertake such a change were present. To these two add habit—it is always so much simpler to ride along in a fixed groove. The result was the continuance into national times of colonial economic practice and attitudes. And

the boon of freer trade with the world outside, for which the colonials had continually struggled, proved to be no unmixed blessing. Argentina continued to concentrate on growing wheat and raising beef; Mexico on mining her silver; Brazil on producing sugar and coffee, and so on.

During the course of the nineteenth century there were changes in the economies of a few of the nations. New products appeared—Chile discovered her nitrate fields, Bolivia's tin found a world market, and so did Ecuador's cacao—but, even then, there was a tendency to “put all the eggs in one basket.” Unfortunately for the Latin Americas, the world demand for her products of field and forest and subsoil grew and many of the countries enjoyed great prosperity, thus seeming to give the lie to men who talked differentiation. But days of reckoning came, when periodic slumps overtook world economies. The “youngsters” were poorly trained for the pace of modern Western life, which by mid-nineteenth century had been highly accelerated by the machine, the child of the second of the revolutions mentioned earlier. The conditioning and reorientation process was slow and beset with much internal disturbance.

All of the Latin-American nations during the “Age of the Caudillos” continued to be predominantly agricultural or extractive countries, a fact which made land the key to

wealth. Therefore, land, its distribution, the uses to which it was put and the relationships flowing from its ownership, all added up to another vexing problem, which cast its shadow over not only Latin-American economy but over her society as well. Land assured the predominance, economic and social and also political, of the *criollo* class and the near-white segment of the *mestizaje*. The unequal distribution of land, a legacy from the colonial centuries, was a factor contributing to the preservation of class stratification, despite the professed belief in the fundamental equality of man. It is an obvious factor making for economic inequality. Not so clearly evident, yet very real, is the connection between land distribution and the political instability so characteristic of the period.

As long as land was concentrated in the hands of the few, there was too small a proportion of the population having a definite stake in the maintenance of law and order. Thus, many folk—the landless and, therefore, the wealthless—had little to lose in supporting a revolutionary movement. The *caudillos* played to this majority, at least in their "campaign programs," those high-sounding and magnanimous *pronunciamientos* with which Latin-American national histories are so liberally dotted. Few revolutionary leaders gave a second thought to these generous promises, once they had achieved power and were com-

fortably located beside the national treasury. The disappointed and thwarted poor were ready for the next spell-binder. And the process began all over again. The young Latin Americas were never quite able to make practice square with theory.

RACIAL MIXTURE

The "Age of the *Caudillos*" had still another problem along the way of "modernization." This grew out of the presence of the pure-blood and mixed-blood elements in the population. Most of the nations had some percentage of native Americans in their citizenry; some had a high percentage. The diffusion of the Negro and of Negro blood was not quite so universal, but in the island republics and in the old sugar-plantation areas of Brazil the slaves or their descendants bulked to a sizable proportion of the population. The incorporation and integration of these varied ethnic elements into the body politic, social and economic was a major challenge to leaders who professed to believe that "all men are created equal."

During colonial times the Indians had been in the status of wards or minors, at least legally. More regularly than not they had been thoroughly exploited by the white minority; but, nevertheless, they had been preserved as a race. The North American Indian had not fared too well at the hands of the Anglo. The Indian problem in the United States

was never a frightfully serious one—an extinct race creates no difficulties, save possibly for the historian and the anthropologist. At the opening of the independence era in the Latin Americas there was a large group of "citizens," enjoying, on paper at least, newly-won rights and privileges. Preparation for the duties of citizenship, the Indians had none; as for an understanding of the same, they possessed even less. Independence made very little difference in their actual status. Financially, too, and socially they were at a distinct disadvantage. Yet, on their elevation to the proposed national level of liberty and equality rested success or failure in one aspect of the process of "modernization" to which the young nations pledged themselves.

POLITICAL INSTABILITY

Politically, this large Indian and also the lower-*mestizo* class offered a strong temptation to the adventurer, of whom the Latin Americas have had more than their rightful share. Power could so easily be built upon the votes of this group or, what was more usual, upon its physical support. Economically, it was far too easy for wealthy landowners and others to continue their aristocratic ways, so much at variance with the "modern" pattern, at the expense of the hapless Indian and the poorer *mestizo*. These had no means and no organization by which to fight against

this continued exploitation. Socially, this group was ready-made for the disturbing experiments of the social reformers and the champions of lost causes. Poverty, disease, squalor, ignorance, and all the rest of those things which were supposed to be out-of-date in "modern" society were so many challenges to Liberals, Socialists, humanitarians, and others of the breed. The mere presence of such a class could and did provide another element of instability in the life of the young nations.

Most of the Spanish Latin-Americans had written the abolition of human bondage into their early constitutions. Brazil emancipated her slaves much later in the nineteenth century. But, no more in Latin than in Anglo America, was freedom for the Negro the complete solution. He was no better off than the Indian. And the fact that the Latin is less race-conscious than his Anglo brother did not eliminate the problem which the Negro and the Negroid classes presented to the young nations.

Liberty, freedom, equality, opportunity were grand ideals. Profession of belief in and acceptance of the same were the easiest of the steps toward their realization. They presented major challenges, and in distressingly varied forms, to the Latin-American nations. Maybe Latin-American historiography can find in them and their impact a key to synthesis.

Relations of Business to Labor

*Reprinted from CIP NEWS LETTER**

A GROUP of American businessmen recently completed a three-year study on the problem of "establishing sound, cooperative relations between workers and management." The group, led by Robert Wood Johnson, enlisted the support not only of businessmen but also of economists, educators, editors, clergymen and union leaders. The first report of its conclusions appeared in the form of an article in the *Harvard Business Review* (Sept., 1949), entitled "Human Relations in Modern Business." The final report, under the same title, has recently become available in book form.¹

The work of this group is of particular importance because it aims at nothing less than the establishment of a cooperative association between management and labor as the only means of overcoming their antagonism. Their conclusions are frankly offered as "a pattern for action." While they do not claim to be detailed or final, they are proposed as outlining a solution. The importance and merit of the group's work lies in their effort to make clear what basic ethical principles must be ob-

served for establishing sound and progressive relations between management and labor.

LIVING WAGE

I. *For a sound labor-management policy it is essential to recognize the need of labor for a secure and living wage.*

Labor unions, at their beginning and to a lesser extent still today, frequently call themselves "bread and butter unions." Such a phrase emphasizes what labor has long considered its primary need—the need, i.e., for a job that pays a decent wage capable of supporting the worker and his family. The history of trade unionism is in large part the story of the workers' efforts to obtain a bargaining position in which they could demand and obtain a proper wage.

To a large extent that fight has now been won. This is not to say that every worker now in fact receives an adequate and stable wage, which is not true. But it is now recognized as a basic principle that a worker has a right to a job and a living wage. This appears clearly from the con-

¹ *Human Relations in Modern Business.* Prentice-Hall.

* 5 Beekman St., New York 7, N. Y., December 17, 1949.

sideration given in the report to what it calls "the basic instinct for survival" and the desire for "security."

Noting that man's desire to live is "more than an instinct: it is an elementary right and duty," this group of business leaders find the basis of this right in the "sacredness (of) human life, derived from man's spiritual nature and his creation by God." On the negative side, this means that it is wrong to take a life, and, on the positive side, it leads to the conclusion that man has a "right to live and to have access to the means necessary to this end."

In the present-day complex industrial world this right demands what the report calls "a moral wage." Its normal standard is described as the "family wage," i.e., an income to support the worker and his family. Such a wage, the report goes on to say, "should be considered as a prime cost of industry . . . a fixed minimum."

The worker needs not only a living but also a secure wage. Because of the fluctuating character of much modern business, the report points out that this demand can be met only partially by an individual business. It emphasizes, however, that it still is a business responsibility, and that management should seek to understand and satisfy the need behind the workers' demand for such things as an annual guaranteed wage, and the surety of employment. As these businessmen write: "The worker's

drive to live is met only in part by a moral wage. Good wages are not enough. Job opportunity, a chance to earn promotion, and job security are needed to complete the picture."

LABOR UNIONS

II. For a sound labor-management policy it is essential to recognize that it is natural and normal for labor to associate in unions.

Labor unions, even at their start, were not solely concerned with obtaining a better wage. They were also associations of men engaged in a common work and having a common purpose. Today, the pure "bread and butter union" has all but disappeared.

Employers in the past have sometimes claimed that the existence of unions causes a conflict of loyalties in the workers, when allegiance to the union is set against loyalty to the company. That there is often tension and conflict is undeniable. But, as the report points out, "the economic function of unionism has obscured its other aspects as a natural organization of people of like interests and problems."

The associational aspect of the labor union has its root in the fact that "man by his nature craves the society of his fellow man. He needs companionship and the good will of his associates. . . . It manifests itself in the informal groupings which are found in factories as well as country

clubs. But it also takes more stable forms, in the way of permanent organizations of men having common interests. Such . . . is the labor union."

The group did not attempt to "evaluate unions." They emphasize, however, that the union not only satisfies a natural need of the worker, but can fulfill an essential task in the enterprise itself. It provides a means for working out and achieving "programs of teamwork, communication, and participation." But most important of all, it meets "the desire that men have for a voice in matters which affect their lives . . . not only conditions immediately surrounding work but national conditions which affect all industries and influence stability and security in employment."

Although not attempting to discuss the problem of union's rights, the report does consider the question of management rights. This issue is at present probably the thorniest issue in labor-management relations. The report suggests that the controversy might not be so bitter "if the word 'interest' be substituted for 'right.'" This would have the immediate value of introducing greater flexibility in the discussion. Interests are less rigid than rights and admittedly more open to change. In this sense, the group in fact recommends that both business and labor recognize that their interests in the enterprise or its various

parts are subject to change under changing conditions.

HUMAN DIGNITY

III. *For a sound labor-management policy it is essential to recognize that the worker is entitled to respect for his dignity as a man and a partner in a common enterprise.*

Great emphasis in the report is placed upon the need for recognizing the dignity of the worker as a man. In this it frankly adopts the position that human relations in industry are "more than matters of expediency, sound psychology, or profitable business." It finds the basis for this contention in the fact that "if we accept the brotherhood of man under God, important conclusions follow: Each man has an inner dignity, with basic rights and duties. Life has an overall purpose. Men must judge their conduct, not merely in terms of personal gain or convenience but also as right or wrong. Service to society, as well as to personal interest, becomes important. Teamwork and cooperation follow."

Adherence to these truths leads the group to claim that only by conceiving of the enterprise as a cooperative effort of both management and labor is it possible to realize these truths in industrial relations. For this reason it proposes that the industrial or business enterprise be conceived of as a "mutual trusteeship," involving "a genuine attitude

of trusteeship, or social responsibility, on the part of both labor and management."

The report points out that society in the past century has swung between two extremes: a "ruthless competition" at the one extreme, which disregarded labor, the consumer and the common good; and at the other "a trend towards economic concentration," which in effect had the same results. Both denied the interdependence of labor and management and, in fact, of all men living in society.

The conception of trusteeship in industrial relations would rectify these evils. It supposes, to begin with, the interdependence of men, including labor and management. In becoming a working reality, it would also preserve what there is of good

in the two extremes: "In an atmosphere of trusteeship, the real merits of competition—the fostering of initiative and resourcefulness and the making of a better and cheaper product—could be maintained without turning economic life into a pitiless struggle for survival. Likewise, the merits of business cooperation—order, planning and stability—could be retained without titanic concentrations of economic power which impair economic freedom or even the technical inertia and exploitation of consumers, which often accompany monopoly." At the same time, the report contends, it offers the surest means of preventing the tensions between labor and management from degenerating into class war, since it builds on "our points of common interest, not merely our differences."



"From the Rising of the Sun . . ."

"At the Last Supper on Holy Thursday Jesus Christ changed bread into His sacred Body and wine into His precious Blood. That was the first Holy Mass, to be consummated in a bloody manner on the cross of Good Friday. Then He said: 'Do this for a commemoration of Me.' By these words He signified that He wanted the Holy Eucharist as an unbloody Sacrifice and a Sacrament to continue on to the end of time, and so by these same words He established the priesthood to consecrate and hand on these priceless gifts down the centuries. The command of Christ has been carried out. In good times and in bad, through thick and thin, the priest has continued to offer Sacrifice and give the Bread of Life to the faithful. Whenever the Church is respected and in her glory, in the grand cathedrals of the world, the priest stands at the altar saying Mass. Whenever the Church is despised and persecuted, the priest still goes on saying Mass, albeit in a hovel or in the open air."—Augustine Klaas, S.J., in *The JESUIT BULLETIN, Missouri Province*, June, 1950.

Literature on Christian Science

W. H. HINGSTON, S.J.

*Reprinted from the CANADIAN MESSENGER OF THE SACRED HEART**

BY FAR the most authoritative work on the Foundress of Christian Science, Mary Baker Eddy, and her teachings was written, in 1909, by Georgine Milmine, who had as her assistant a young writer afterward destined to literary fame, Willa Cather. Miss Milmine's book is a model of most careful and painstaking research. Yet the story is told most interestingly, not at all made heavy by the many documents introduced, and the style is altogether charming, scholarly and courteous. It was first brought out serially in *McClure's Magazine*, and was revised and published in book form two years later under the title *The Life of Mary Baker G. Eddy, and History of Christian Science*.

The work appeared in the lifetime of Mrs. Eddy and of thousands of contemporaries who could testify to their personal knowledge of the events related. The magazine articles, and to a somewhat less extent the book, are filled with photographs of the principal persons who play a part in Mrs. Eddy's life-story and of scenes and places where events took place. Knowing full well that the least thing

said in disparagement of the Foundress and Discoverer, or the least doubt cast on any item of the Eddy fable, would be at once indignantly denied; and, of course, perfectly aware that very many of the statements she would have to make would flatly contradict the statements circulated for years by a very powerful organization — whether these emanated from the Christian Science Publications Committee or from the pen of Mrs. Eddy herself — Miss Milmine took the wise precaution of advancing nothing without proof. Early letters in the hand-writing of Mrs. Eddy were reproduced by photostat; so, too, announcements and advertisements from the files of old newspapers, certified copies of public records, signed affidavits of contemporary witnesses, etc. Nothing was neglected that diligent search could establish beyond doubt. As a result, Miss Milmine's book was so completely documented that answer to it was impossible, and, in fact, *has never been attempted*. It was most fortunate for the sake of historical truth that Miss Milmine wrote when she did — before the disappearance of

* 2 Dale Ave., Toronto 5, Ont., Canada, April, 1948.

those many contemporaries who could bear witness to the earlier facts of Mrs. Eddy's life.

How then did Christian Science meet the challenge of that book? This is an interesting point, though little to the credit of that society which prides itself on being, above all things, respectable. Some years previously to this Mrs. Eddy had established within her organization a permanent vigilance committee, The Christian Science Committee on Publications, to deal with such awkward problems, and this committee set vigorously to work.

The measures resorted to were two-fold—those that smacked of blackmail and those that were plain boycott. But, before entering into the story of this sad business, let us pause a moment and view the situation as it appeared to Miss Milmine at the time. And let us not withhold from a very brave woman the tribute of our admiration for her courage. For it must have taken a rare degree of courage to be the first to present a mass of connected and conclusive evidence against a baneful myth which hundreds of thousands of influential persons cling to as articles of faith; and, proofs in hand, to retell, in a way far different from the accepted version, the story of Mrs. Eddy's life; and to call upon people who regarded this lady as more than a prophetess, more than a human being, even as a new Messias, the equal of Christ Him-

self (and by many considered superior to Him), to reconsider their estimate of her in the light of proven facts, and to ask themselves if this woman was not a rather poor specimen of our human kind, a creature remarkable, indeed, in many ways, but not for traits or conduct of which human nature can be proud. At least Miss Milmine was sincere. And she was daring to a degree, for she knew well what a storm of opposition would rise against her.

What chance had Miss Milmine as she entered the lists, a solitary knight-errant of the pen, championing the truth as she had found it? Would she, at least, be assured of a fair contest? The point at issue was solely the truth, or the falsity, of the Eddy legend. That and nothing else. She did not ask that anything should be believed on her own word. She welcomed fair and honorable opposition. She asked that Truth should prevail.

AGAINST HEAVY ODDS

Leaving aside for the moment all question as to which party in the controversy was right and which was wrong, it can be seen that the contest itself was unequal. The sympathies of any one with the least spark of chivalry or even of fair play will go to the woman who entered the lists against tremendous odds, with nothing to uphold her except her moral consciousness of telling the truth. Every worldly interest stood arrayed

against her. She was alone: her opponents were many. She was not rich: Mrs. Eddy and her corporation were enormously wealthy. She had no influence to speak of: they had a powerful press; a vast organization, that covered the whole country; hundreds of thousands of enthusiastic and devoted disciples, who could be counted on to perform with blind obedience whatever was required of them.

Her opponents held all the advantages of the position. The Eddy legend was in possession. The burden of proof lay upon her. They had but to deny: she must prove her every assertion. In seeking her material by her own endeavors over several years of painstaking research she had received none of those helps usually supplied to the biographer; instead, she had found her work hampered at every turn by the hostility of the influential Mother Church: those whom she set out to expose had at their disposal every source of information and a most efficient body of writers to make use of whatever advantage they possessed. It was almost as if she were going on trial herself. Her book would be in the hands of her adversaries. They would scan it, scrutinize it, search it for some misstatement, for some mistake, for some inaccuracy however slight; and, having found something which, even though accurate, she would be unable to substantiate with proofs, nothing would be

easier for them than to pounce upon this, exploit it, smother her in ridicule, discredit her utterly, blast her error with the truth—supposing, of course, that the truth were on their side and not on hers.

The scene shifts now from the doughty champion of truth to her less doughty adversaries. It is right that this tribute of praise be rendered her, for, as we are about to see, she was worsted (though not in fair fight) and was to see the book that had cost her such labor disappear from circulation, not even its title listed in approved bibliographies; while those precious articles of hers on Christian Science lay buried forever in back numbers of an old monthly magazine. Nevertheless, the service she rendered was invaluable, and every one who has since written or will write intelligently upon Christian Science must acknowledge indebtedness to her work.

TRUTH SUPPRESSED

Even encyclopedias and similar works of reference (such as the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1911, 1929, 1936, the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, *Chambers' Encyclopedia*, in their articles on Mrs. Eddy and Christian Science were compelled to omit from the list of recommended standard works bearing on the subject all mention of the scholarly *Life of Miss Milmine*, and instead had to refer the reader—as to the only “au-

thentic" biography—to the trashy, fulsome *Life* supplied by the Christian Science Committee on Publication, through one of its members, Miss Sibyl Wilbur, or to the autobiographical notes of Mrs. Eddy herself. More surprising still: not one of the many works written in condemnation of Mrs. Eddy appears in the bibliographical lists of these encyclopedias. This is a strange attitude to be taken by standard works of reference, reputedly scholarly and supposedly impartial, to ignore even the existence of a controversy relative to the reputation of Mrs. Eddy; thus creating the impression that there are no two opinions regarding this person, but only unbounded enthusiasm and religious veneration. Is there in these huge works of reference a single other example of such one-sidedness? But Christian Science pressure can be strong! It resulted in one instance in an entire volume of a many-volume work of reference being withdrawn until amended, because one article in that volume displeased the Christian Science Church.

A similar fate has overtaken several other attempts at telling the truth. Thus, the posthumous *Memoirs of Mary Baker Eddy*, being the personal recollections of one who was for many years Mrs. Eddy's closest friend and adviser, and who had lived at her home for many years—Adam Herbert Dickey, Doctor of Christian Sci-

ence—was suppressed immediately on its appearance, in 1927, and copies already sold were bought back. This is all the more surprising because Dr. Dickey, who had been for so long the one most intimately associated with Mrs. Eddy as friend and chief adviser, could surely write from first-hand knowledge.

Like tactics were attempted with regard to a still more telling history, but fortunately with less complete results, when Charles Scribner and Sons had the courage to bring out in 1929 *The Biography of a Virginal Mind*, by the well-known writer, Edwin Franden Dakin. Messrs. Scribner have since let the public in on the secret of the underhand attacks made upon them. First of all, before the manuscript was set up in print, the Christian Science Committee on Publication demanded that they be allowed to revise the text. This was, of course, refused. Then threats were issued. These were ignored. The book came out, but only to be met by a carefully planned campaign of suppression. In every city of any size, booksellers, department stores, and all such agencies for the sale of books were interviewed at once by prominent Christian Scientists, and strongly advised not to allow the book to appear on their shelves, under pain of forfeiting the patronage of the Christian Scientists, whom this publication offended. Newspapers and magazines that publish book-reviews

were told either to condemn the new book as false and unreliable, or better still to ignore it. Yet Scribners, which was to be neither bribed nor intimidated, held out, and won thereby the unanimous commendation of the Authors' Guild, which congratulated them on their courageous resistance to intimidation. Nonetheless, this book also is now extremely rare.

"NOT ON THE SHELVES"

I shall now relate my own experience in trying to get behind the iron curtain of silence. My search for materials began when I submitted a list of standard and reliable works on Mrs. Eddy and Christian Science at the library of the University of Toronto. Not one of the works I wanted was even listed in the catalog! I bethought myself then of the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., to which by Act of Congress two copies must be sent of every publication copyrighted in the United States. I went to Washington. Dakin's book was available. I found it in the department of Rare Books. Milmine's book was, indeed, listed. But, when I asked for it, my reader's slip was returned with the form answer: "Not on the shelves." I referred my request to the Superintendent of the Reading-Room, and enquiries were set on foot, and the information was brought to light that sometime somehow the book had simply vanished!

Yet the trip to Washington and the week spent in the Library of Congress were not entirely barren of results. Fortunately for truth, Miss Milmine's book had first appeared serially in *McClure's Magazine* in 1907 and 1908, and these volumes were to be had in the great Library. I was obligingly supplied with photostatic copies of the now unobtainable book of Dr. Dickey, previously mentioned, and of the almost equally rare first edition of Mrs. Eddy's *Science and Health*, before she had an after-thought and added to the title the words *and a Key to The Scriptures*. This was, indeed, an unexpected find, for it is decades since the last copy of that book disappeared from the stacks of the Boston Public Library. These two books are kept in Washington under lock and key. Other books were found, yet not the substantial work of Mr. Frederick W. Peabody, *The Religio-Medical Masquerade* (1910, 1915), an indictment so damning that *The New York Times* said of it:

There is absolutely no middle ground. Either Mr. Peabody is the most shameless of calumniators or Mrs. Eddy is the basest of charlatans. Mr. Peabody expresses an eager readiness to have this question submitted to any test. His charges run the whole gamut from attempted murder to accomplished theft, with endless lying scattered all in between. They are not vague, but definite, and every one of them can be settled as true or untrue. Why do the Eddyites wait? The courts are open,

and, unless Mr. Peabody is a convicted slanderer, no sane or decent person, man or woman, can afford to give countenance to Christian Science.

Thus *The New York Times*. Could anything be stronger—or more reasonable? Mr. Peabody was an eminent member of the Boston bar and was counsel against Mrs. Eddy in many of her lawsuits. Yet *no reply was ever made*. That book also has completely disappeared. Its title is not even listed in the Library of Congress catalogue. A great loss certainly. Valuable evidence has been successfully scuttled.

NOT TO BE HAD

To make up in small measure for the loss of that book now unobtainable, I was able to peruse the report of a speech delivered several years earlier by Mr. Peabody at Tremont Temple, Boston, on August 1, 1901, the title of which is *A Complete Exposé of Eddyism or Christian Science and the Plain Truth in Plain Terms regarding Mary Baker Eddy*. For sheer strength of impassioned invective there are passages in that speech that could stand alongside the fine pages of Cicero's *Against Verres*, or of Demosthenes' *First Philippic*. It is not billingsgate, nor ill-temper, but lofty, controlled, burning indignation, born of the patriotic desire to warn friends and the public of the danger to the nation from an insidious disease of the mind that has already

poisoned many lives and that he finds being spread through the nation by a group of unprincipled, conscienceless charlatans, mouthing piety. Mr. Peabody does his best to sting Mrs. Eddy and her organization into making a reply. He deliberately lays himself wide-open to prosecution for criminal libel, should he fail to substantiate each separate one of the charges he has made. He accuses them of lying and of calumny, and—worse—he turns upon the attorneys of Mrs. Eddy and attacks them by name, hoping that they, at least, will defend themselves or stand convicted before the bar of public opinion. *Mr. Peabody was left unanswered*. But his voice has been effectively silenced. His book no longer speaks. It is not to be had. The tactics of the Boston Mother Church have triumphed over him.

His speech can be read in that dilapidated copy among the Rare Books of The Library of Congress. But Mr. Peabody's great work, his substantial volume packed with incriminating facts and his logical deductions therefrom, is no longer on the shelves, not even in library catalogues. It is not to be had. To only a few is it known that this book was ever written. The tactics of the Mother Church have won out.

But these are only a few specimens from a number of strange disappearances. It was Father Lambert who in his *Notes on Ingersoll* did more

than any other man to arrest the effects of this eloquent agnostic. His treatment of Christian Science would surely make interesting reading, but his book is not listed in the Library of Congress. Books published in England, like those of Wortham and of Fisher, are understandably not listed in Washington. But what of Bellwald (1922), Appler (1908), Barrington (1898), Garrison (1900), and literally a hundred others, all published and copyrighted in the United States; all, therefore, at one time in the Library of Congress? What has become of them?

They bore expressive titles, like *Christian Science Exposed*, *The Word of a Woman vs. The Word of God*, *The Sophistries of Christian Science*, *Christian Science Dissected*, *The Church of St. Bunco's*, *Christian Science Against Both Science and The Bible*.

And how is it that so very well-known a book as *Christian Science*, by the prince of American humorists, Mark Twain, has vanished from the shelves and from the catalog? Through three hundred pages he kept his hearers rocking with merriment as he exposed Mrs. Eddy, her doings and teachings, as only he could relate them. Is it just another coincidence that that particular volume of his works should have vanished?

With such a record behind them the Christian Science Committee on Publications cannot easily be freed

from the imputation of dishonesty and bad faith.

A NOTABLE CONTRAST

Before closing this article we may be allowed a brief digression, a reflection which is prompted by a contrast. Charges are made unceasingly against the Catholic Church. An answer is always given. New accusations (when there are any that are new) are invariably discussed by competent Catholics, and full light is thrown upon the alleged disgraceful fact or on the so-called error, usually to the discomfiture of the accuser. Flowing continuously from the press is a flood of anti-Catholic literature. Gross misrepresentation of Catholic doctrine and practice, shameless distortion of history, insults the most outrageous, charges the most infamous and the filthiest directed against all that Catholics hold in sacred esteem—nothing is wanting. It is very painful that it should be so, but Catholics in our day endure it, as they have done in the past, as they will continue to do until the end.

But here is a notable and very significant difference between the practice of Catholics and the practices of those whom we have been studying. In that immense Library of Congress, I, and the General Public, could have found, I doubt not, anti-Catholic books of every description and almost without number: the railings of the nit-wit, the works of the "escaped

nun," the exposures made by the "ex-priest," the completely discredited books of this one and that one (whose names I have erased from my manuscript so as not to advertise them), the weekly shrieks of the Reverend Bigot, with an eye to the collection plate, even the foul and salacious pages of Bland Blank. While on the other hand, and by contrast, the standard, well-written temperate scholarly books of authors of repute, if they show Mrs. Eddy and the organization she founded in an unfavorable light, are practically unobtainable by the public anywhere, even in that literary storehouse of the nation, in Washington, D.C.

TRUTH IS FEARED

Why this difference? Is it not because it is the truth that is so dangerous? An organization possessed of the truth can withstand the shock of untrue accusations. But an organization that is based on deception cannot withstand the truth, but must resort, if it is to survive, to every means, no matter how dishonorable, to keep from others a knowledge of the truth. The frantic, unscrupulous, underhand measures and efforts at concealment adopted by Mrs. Eddy and after her by the Mother Church of Christ, Scientist are their own worst possible advertisement. Honest persons in good faith never do so act. The acts of Christian Science amount to almost an implicit admission that the life of

Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy and Christian Science, of which she is hailed the Foundress and Discoverer, cannot bear scrutiny. The truth welcomes the light. The false must always shrink from the light and seek the cover of darkness, and fable must shrivel before fact.

We may also add the following pertinent observation, which is fully justified by the combination we have seen of absolute silence with desperate underhand efforts at stifling the evidence. It is this combination of the two things, the pose in public of silence and total unconcern and the pursuing in secret, underhandedly and frantically, relentlessly and by every means, the total destruction of what in public was treated as a matter too trivial to be noticed. That is certainly suggestive. It might be said significant. For, *supposing* that Mrs. Eddy, her cooperators and abettors, honestly believed what they taught, and really felt within themselves that they could have no reason to fear exposure, but rather that fuller knowledge of the truth could turn only to their advantage, how, I ask, is it possible that they could have acted as they did? It is simply inconceivable. While, on the other hand, *if* Mrs. Eddy and the officers of her organization were not in good faith, but were fully conscious that they were perpetuating a monstrous and infamous deception (because of the financial returns which this deception brought

in), then all that strange manner of meeting the challenge of truth would occasion no surprise at all, for it would be just what could have been expected.

The sorry record of intrigue which

we have placed before our readers does not make either pleasant or edifying reading, but it does suggest several very pertinent reflections. The article can be aptly summarized "a study in concealment."



On Judging Others

"It will help immensely if Americans remember that Europe's groping toward integration brings the people of Europe up against exactly the same species and even the same subspecies of economic problems that we have at home. It is no easier for a Danish or Swiss member of Parliament to vote for measures that will hurt the immediate interest of his farmer constituents than it is for an Iowa or Texas Congressman. Europe is maintaining un-economic industries by various measures of government protection and control that cut down trade within Europe. But the United States is maintaining a price for dried eggs that has resulted in ten years' supply nobody wants, being produced and stored up in government warehouses.

"European trade unions gang up with employers to fight imports instead of meeting import competition by modernizing and pressing for lower costs. But American unions gang up with employers to prevent imports from Europe, while the taxpayers of the United States are digging into their pockets to provide dollars that Europe cannot earn. None of these things makes economic sense."—*Michael L. Hoffman in the NEW YORK TIMES MAGAZINE, January 29, 1950.*



Same Old World

"Man in the 20th century has become so intrigued by and so dependent upon technology that he seems to have forgotten that discoveries and inventions in the fields of science, mechanical and electric energy in their manifold applications—all these wonderful gadgets and devices thus made available—are after all not an end in themselves but merely tools to be used by man in the improvement and development of his life on this earth. Further, these wonderful discoveries have not repealed a single one of the Ten Commandments nor a single one of the basic laws of human nature or the laws governing and controlling the development of the spiritual life of the human being."—*W. C. Mullendore, "Responsibilities of the Engineer," ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING, October, 1949, p. 830.*

Social Role of the Parish Priest

JOSEPH H. FICHTER, S.J.

*Reprinted from SOCIAL ORDER**

FROM a sociological point of view the status of the priest in the parochial structure is in need of redefinition. Traditionally we have thought of him only in his "priestly role" and have had a fairly clear concept of what this means. The "priestly" priest is holy, industrious, knowledgeable and intelligent. In his relationship with parishioners he has been expected and urged to fulfill two predominant functions: that of mediator and that of father.

Certainly, the priestly role demands these two qualities in the modern urban parish, but it seems to me that the time has come to re-examine their implications and possibly to question their adequacy.

The priest as *mediator* has most commonly signified his pivotal, *individual* function as the spiritual pleader between God and the people, a kind of channel through whom supernatural life flows to the laity, a sort of distribution center for sanctifying grace. After all, he is the minister of the Sacraments, the celebrant of Masses, the voice of God in the pulpit; and in all of these activities he has been primarily concerned

with the sanctification and salvation of the individual.

The same may be said of the paternal role of the priest. *Fatherliness*, the pastoral attitude in the care of souls, is connoted in the "fatherly" advice and assistance that is directed to individual problems of the flock. We characteristically think of it as a job to be done for the drunken husband, the delinquent boy, the unchaste wife, the girl in trouble, each of them stressing the person-to-person relationship on the basis of an individual problem.

NEW ROLE DEVELOPS

My belief is that this simple, old-fashioned concept of the priestly role is no longer realistic in the conditions of a modern urban parish. It may have been satisfactory and certainly was productive of much good in another age and another environment, but the modern city priest is challenged by a whole complex of demands that cannot be met through the simple roles of mediator and father.

For example, he has to be a *businessman*, at least to the extent of

raising and administering the funds required for the maintenance of his parish plant. Bishops no longer accept slipshod financial reports that have been carried around under the pastor's hat. This managerial role is a difficult one and is frequently in conflict with the higher values contained in the spiritual role. The pastor has to be an *organizer* for the internal sub-groups of his parish, the lay societies that will not function properly without his executive guidance. In some instances this role will extend to diocesan organizations of various kinds. Again, the priest is expected to play a *civic* role. As a respected and influential citizen he may be called on to cooperate with Mayor's committees, Rotarians' projects, and so forth. In a sense, too, without "getting into politics" he has to play a *political* role in his community. What Southern priests said for and against the Dixiecrats last November had much more significance than most of us think.

HAS SOCIAL FUNCTION

All of this indicates the complexity of the pastor's position. But besides all this, and permeating all of it, is the *social role* of the priest. The position he takes here depends upon the kind of *social conscience* he has, and determines the kind of social action, or social reform, he will promote. Of course, a social-minded priest is still responsible for the care of individual

souls, but he amplifies his concept of the individual. He takes the parishioner for what he is: a social being with all kinds of *related* bonds and functions and needs. In other words, in order to know and assist the *whole* person he must know the parishioner in his social context, as a member of a family, of an occupational group, of recreational, neighborhood and other groups.

From this point of view, the components of the Catholic parish are not primarily its individual parishioners, but its family groups. Hence the pastor has a definite *social* relationship to a parishioner as a member of a family, rather than a merely *individual* relationship to him as an unattached person.

Whether or not we can recognize it, every pastor has some sort of social conscience and plays some sort of social role. Sociologically, a role is a combination of patterns, that is, of recurrent uniformities of thought and behavior. Roughly speaking, there are two sources of these patterns: a) the local community where the parish is situated; b) the wider doctrinal and empirical traditions of the Catholic Church. I think it can be said that today there is a conflict constantly going on between these two: the ways of the world as accepted and practiced in the community, and the ways of God as taught and worked for in the Church.

In an urban parish this conflict is

dynamic. New challenges by the community are met with new responses by the Church. Both sides are changing all the time. Since these two sources of social patterns are in constant flux, the social role of the pastor which results from them is also constantly reshaping itself.

Let me exemplify this problem from a Southern urban parish which I have been studying closely for a year and a half. There are some well-defined social attitudes in the community concerning housing, labor unions, public aid to education and race relations. (There are others, but these four will suffice to make this point.) I need not recount what the Church and Catholic sociologists advocate in these social problems, but I must remark that the attitude of the parish priests here veers more to the mind of the local community than to that of the Church. In other words, they seem to be more the product of their community's social thought than they are the moulders and leaders of that thought.

The community is bourgeoisie-minded; not merely "conservative" as opposed to "liberal." It has great faith in successful and respectable persons who "know what is best" for the rank and file. The priests of the parish are kind and gentle and paternal to the individual sufferers from the selfish profit system; but they hesitate to question the validity and sacredness of the system which

brings about such suffering. Their social philosophy seems to be formed by contact with and experience in the local community rather than by a knowledge of the social encyclicals.

EXAMPLES CITED

Take the matter of *housing*, for example. Ninety-one of the 1,806 family units in the parish are doubling up with relatives. This means that 182 families, approximately ten per cent of all the families in the parish, do not have the primary requisite of privacy.

Eighteen and eight-tenths per cent of all the households are paying less than \$20 a month rent, and this means in practice that they are existing in physical surroundings hardly conducive to good family life. Only 17.7 per cent of the households are occupied by their owners, a fact which is reflected in the instability and mobility of the families in the parish.

The prevailing attitude of the community is against any form of low-cost housing, for two reasons: it would depreciate the neighborhood and bring in undesirables, and secondly, it would promote a trend toward socialism. Furthermore, two or three of the best contributors to the Church have a large investment in rows of slum shacks.

Consider *labor unions*. Many of the parishioners work for a transportation system, and the attempt to

unionize was broken up by the transit company twenty years ago. The community has come to believe that the strike at that time was lead by outside subversives and radicals. Despite the fact that low rental is a reflection of low income, which in turn is a reflection of poor bargaining power, the community generally is anti-organized-labor. Furthermore, there exists in this parish a capitalist-minded group of prominent Catholic laymen who are successful businessmen.

Take the question of *public aid to parochial education*. The pastor refuses to have anything to do with the free-lunch program. This may or may not be a good thing, but the point of importance is his reason for refusal. He maintains that it makes the children dependent; it takes away their initiative and self-reliance, so that they will eventually grow up to be lazy socialists. This again is almost identical with the kind of social thinking prevalent in the community.

Finally, there is the question of *race relations*. I do not have to explain the pattern of segregation and discrimination that exists here. A nearby Church operates for the Negro Catholics, and they simply are not wanted in the white Church. The accepted local attitude is that nothing can or should be done about this. "Time will take care of it." "You can't change things over night." And so forth.

At the expense of repetition I want to say again that the social role of the priest in all of the above examples is formed more on the patterns of the secular community than on the social teaching of the Church. We cannot be surprised, therefore, at the lack of a program of Catholic social action in the parish. Logically, any program for parochial social action will follow from the social philosophy of the priest, and here again we see the conflict between secularism and spirituality. In the parish we studied, the spiritual and corporal works of mercy seem to be influenced more by community values than by Catholic social teaching.

DIRECT AND INDIRECT ACTION

For purposes of clarification we may divide organized social action into two kinds: direct and indirect. The *direct* is primarily remedial in nature while the *indirect* is preventive. There are in this parish two organizations, St. Vincent de Paul Society and St. Margaret's Daughters, which are intended to perform the corporal works of mercy. In this pursuit, of course, they are in primary contact with the "social problems" of the parish. They visit the homes of needy persons and attempt to give economic aid.

The St. Vincent de Paul Society is made up of nine men, all over 45, who meet once a week at the rectory. They never have more than four or

five cases at a time, and the visits are usually made by the brothers in pairs. The organization spends about \$30 a week in food tickets usable at a local chain store. They attempt to keep their bank balance as close to \$2,000 as they can. They are very careful in doling out any of this money, avoid carrying anybody on the books for more than two months, and often take the expressed attitude: "If they won't go to Mass, we won't help them."

The St. Margaret's Daughters are all elderly (average age about 48), and they are no longer organized for home visiting. They do not want younger members because of the "danger in visiting such places." They use their funds for outfitting needy children for First Communion and Confirmation, and cooperate with the diocesan group in providing a two-weeks' summer vacation for poor mothers and children.

These are the only two organizations in the parish that might be said to be interested in *direct* social welfare. Other groups are formed mainly for the youth of the parish in an attempt to interest them in activities of a character-building nature. One boy scout troop and one cub pack are under the direction of lay persons. The girls' Sodality has only seven active members and is floundering badly. The C.Y.O. program for both boys and girls has been relatively successful but is ex-

clusively a sports program without the cultural and religious aspects that are part of the over-all plan. All of this youth activity is an extremely important aspect of social action and is usually thought of as the best preventive of delinquency.

In this parish there are neither study nor action groups in any of the fields that require organized reform. For example, no Cana Conference, Maternity Guilds or other group attempts are in existence for the improvement of family life. There are individual laymen interested in race relations but their attention is not primarily focused on the problem as it exists within the parochial territory. There are no credit unions or consumer cooperatives and apparently no interest in them. The lack of any positive program of social action in housing and the field of labor-management relations has already been mentioned.

WHAT OF NEED?

There are two pertinent questions to be asked at this point: a) is there a need for social action in this parish? b) do the priests have time for a program of social action?

As I have already indicated, there is a definite need for social reform, not only for the actual living conditions of an appreciable number of the families, but also for the antiquated, individualistic social philosophy which pervades the upper class

of the parish. However, this need cannot be met in the form of social action until the priests cease conforming to the secular attitudes of the community. So, perhaps the deepest and most fundamental need is a greater social awareness and social conscience on the part of priests.

The second question is not so easy to answer. Are three priests enough to take care of 1,806 families? I do not know. At any rate we may conclude from experience that in any parish only a small handful of adult leaders is required to put into opera-

tion a program of social action. The job of teaching social spirituality can be carried on at all times from the pulpit, in advising lay persons and in conversation. It does not take long for parishioners to learn the social philosophy of their priests. That philosophy may be Christ-derived or community-derived. In either case some of the lay people will reject it. But we must operate on the assumption that the faithful laity will enter a program of social action under the dynamic leadership of the social-minded priest.



Unions—Bulwark Against Communism

"In America the staunchest foe of Communism after the Church is the organized labor movement. Some Communists have crept in—just as they have in schools, churches, government, newspapers and magazines. But by and large no element of the community has fought the Communists with more determination and with greater success. And it has not been an arm-chair warfare either. It has been a rough-and-tumble fight which has cost dearly in hours of service and in many hard-earned dollars. *America is the only country in the world where for years, and years, and years, the labor unions have stood four-square against Marxism.*

"Yet the arm-chair strategists, the defenders of the *status quo*, in the security of their luxurious retreats belittle and belabor the labor movement. In newspapers, magazines and on the radio, they strive to weaken the influence of organized labor. God forbid that they succeed. If they do, the reward of their efforts will be disastrous—and particularly so for them. They will then have been the 'providers for the Communist revolution.'"—*Rev. Joseph F. Donnelly in SOCIAL ACTION BULLETIN, Hartford, Conn., April 15, 1950.*

Editorials

For Peace and Freedom

IN WHAT is perhaps his most comprehensive statement on the present world situation, Secretary Acheson has declared that the United States, the entire free world and our whole civilization are today faced with the threat of annihilation by a fanatical Soviet Communism, which already controls hundreds of millions of people, which possesses the largest military establishment in existence, and which has selected this country as the principal target of attack. To counteract this fanaticism and to meet this menace he has unfurled anew "the most dynamic and most revolutionary" symbol in history—namely, the banner of freedom—and he propounded six "lines of action" to develop our faith, our strength and our unity in the service of "total diplomacy" to save both freedom and peace.

In making these statements Mr. Acheson merely expressed what has become a well-nigh universal conviction throughout the Western World. But his statements are important, nevertheless, because they summarize more forcefully than ever before the premises, the goals and the means of our present foreign policy. In that

sense they represent both a new milestone in the education of the American people and their Government in the realities of present-day international life, and an expression of determination to act on recognized truth. They are especially significant because they are made against the background of the plane incident in the Baltic, which revealed anew both Soviet ruthlessness and Soviet mendacity, and because they provide a clearer frame of reference for the forthcoming meeting of the Western Foreign Ministers and the North Atlantic Council.

Yet, despite the gravity of the Soviet menace and the increasing Soviet provocations, the most important aspect of the "lines of action" proposed by Mr. Acheson is and remains their essential peacefulness and their renunciation of force except in self-defense. Indeed, Mr. Acheson again emphasizes that we shall make no attempt to undermine Soviet independence, and that we shall continue to search for common ground of agreement with the Soviets, both within the United Nations and through other channels. This is in effect another forceful refutation of the Soviet campaign of vilification against the United States, and an-

other challenge to the Soviets to make good on their "peace offensive" by matching their words with deeds.

But Mr. Acheson makes clear beyond the possibility of misunderstanding that we cannot come to any agreement with the Soviets as long as they try to eliminate our existence altogether, or to undermine by hook or crook the free countries of the world along the tried pattern of "one by one." And that statement must be read in the light of Mr. Acheson's Berkeley speech, in which he laid down the terms of any peace we can accept—terms which include the conclusion of peace with a free Germany and Japan and the withdrawal of Soviet military and police forces from the countries they now hold in subjection.

Barring the unlikely eventuality of Soviet acceptance of these terms, Mr. Acheson finds no other alternative except to continue waging "total diplomacy" based on the reassertion of our faith in freedom. For that purpose he reiterates President Truman's request for a campaign of truth to counteract Soviet lies and calls for further action to strengthen our defenses, to create areas of strength abroad by both economic and military help, to expand international trade as the life-blood of the free world, and to improve the machinery for international cooperation, including the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty bodies, the

Council of Europe, the Western Union and the Marshall Plan organization.

But he calls above all for what is most fundamental yet most difficult in a free country built on the idea of diversity—namely, unity and cooperation at home. He does not deny the need of opposition, but he does appeal for efforts toward a consensus of opinion and a close working together between the Executive and Congress, and between both parties in the Congress, irrespective of personal or partisan advantage. The responsible men of both parties have already endorsed this view, and we believe that the nation as a whole does likewise.—*NEW YORK TIMES, New York, N. Y., Apr. 24, 1950.*

The Role of the Church

IN VIEW of the fact that the press is always tempted to misconceive and exploit the role of the Church and the Holy See in the great issue of our times, it is worth underlining again the part it is playing.

The Holy See has only one clear and direct political function, and this is to defend and protect in so far as it is able the temporal conditions within which the Church's spiritual commission can be carried out.

Since it is part of the set policy of Communism to deny to the Church the enjoyment of these temporal conditions for its spiritual work, it is

inevitable that the Holy See finds itself opposed to Communist rulers. But the political quarrel is not of the Church's seeking; nor can it be construed as *political* opposition to Communist regimes as such.

The Church's opposition to Communism is a hundred-per-cent *spiritual* and *moral*, not political. It opposes a heresy—indeed, more than a heresy, since it is fighting, on the spiritual and moral plane, the preaching and imposition of practical and positive atheism.

Equally, when the Holy See excommunicates a Czech priest for accepting an episcopal appointment from the state in defiance of the Holy See, or when a Polish Bishop condemns priests who aid the state in its taking-over of an ecclesiastical charitable organization, we are witnessing purely spiritual and ecclesiastical measures which would be taken against *any* government in the world, not political measures against Communist governments as such.

It is very important to realize this, because the final solution to the Communist problem can never simply be a matter for the Church as such.

The Church's role is to defend the Faith itself and endeavor to protect the faithful in the exercise of their spiritual rights and duties, and to do this against all who endeavor to destroy the Faith and deny the faithful their rights.

In doing this, the Church defends

the *source* of the spiritual, moral and even cultural values which man must in the end use, if so pernicious a doctrine is to be repelled.

But it is ordinary secular states, and ordinary men and women, in their capacity as citizens, who are called upon in the name of such values to wage the political fight and overcome the aggressor against freedom and civilization.

We too readily get into the habit of thinking of the world situation in terms of "Church *versus* Communism." This puts the Church into an invidious position, because it suggests that the Church tolerates everything else, and because it plays into the hands of the Communists who would like to undermine the Church's spiritual authority by arguing that it is political and solely directed against the Communist states. — CATHOLIC HERALD, London, England, Feb. 24, 1950.

The Reign of God and the Modern Tragedy

IN THE 1890's, the Chinese Ambassador at the Court of St. Petersburg, Mr. Shu King-Shen, was discussing the secret of the power of the West, then at its zenith throughout the world, with a young diplomat attached to the Embassy. His view was one which would have astonished most of the leaders and thinkers of the time, as, no doubt, it did the

Chinese pupil who lived to record it in his old age. "*The strength of Europe*," he said, "*is not to be found in her armaments; it is not to be found in her science; it is to be found in her religion.*"

The deep mind of this Oriental, formed in the traditional sanities of the Confucian philosophy, penetrated through the superficialities which misled most of the Westerners of his age—as well as the acute, but shallow Japanese. He saw whence it was that Europeans had received their sense of freedom, human dignity and personal responsibility, their conceptions of right and wrong, of the obligation of duty and diligence; their sense of the right of every man to be treated with the respect due to an immortal being. In the period we call the "Middle Ages" the Catholic Church had slowly—and, alas! imperfectly—tamed the barbarians and morally educated them, by proclaiming the Divine Law as revealed by God to be the Christian rule of life; and also the "Natural Law," the universal moral law written by the same God into the order of the world, applicable to all men, everywhere and at all times. The world was seen, in fact, as morally ordered under the Reign of God. To be sure, rulers constantly disregarded this Higher Law but at least its existence was everywhere asserted and admitted, even by its violators. It was "the salt" of the European earth which gave our civilization the unique moral

strength from which its vital creative energy was derived.

The great tragedy of the modern era is that the diversion of that energy to the mastery of nature has brought about a double process of *external expansion* and *internal decay* and disintegration.

As men became absorbed in purely natural knowledge, wealth and power, they grew richer and overshadowed the world with their domination. Through science they acquired the power to attain an ease and well-being never before known, and to bring the ends of the earth close to one another. But all this time they were losing progressively their hold on the fundamental truths which had given meaning and purpose to their lives and organized activities: the Divine wisdom which they needed more than ever to be a principle of order, in a world where power without law threatened a reign of death. The pioneers of modern secularism held the strange notion that they could abandon belief in the Reign of God over public life, and treat the communities of mankind as "self-sufficient" and sole lords of their world, while still retaining and increasing the living force of moral and humane conceptions which had grown out of the older Christian culture. They wanted the fruits without the tree, the leavened loaf without the yeast.

The collective action of a group of sovereign states recognizing no higher

lawful authority than the wills of their own legislatures, was somehow to produce "a covenant" which would morally restrain all of them. Humanity must be raised to the higher level necessary for its social salvation, by tugging at its own bootstraps: it was to be guaranteed by law a "liberty" which included the right to undermine the very foundation of the idea of truth and moral value in the name of "freedom of thought." It is not surprising that the modern attempt to build a civilized world order has broken down lamentably, and that the completion of the secularist process has resulted, not in a Reign of Man set free by science and enlightenment, but in a sudden and fearful reversion to pagan barbarism, servitude and inhumanity, an increasing degradation of culture and the arts, and a perversion of scientific power and organization to the purposes of the "revolution of destruction."

Secularization—the denial of the Reign of God—is a process of negation which has worked itself out through our "age of progress" to the point of annulling and frustrating all the values which are necessary for the conduct of human life. Man—so the Christian wisdom tells us—was created by God out of *nothing*: and to the extent that he "emancipates" himself from God by self-assertion and self-worship, he is successful, not in inflating himself to a pseudo-godhead through knowledge and power, but in

moving in the direction of "nothingness" through internal anarchy, race-suicide and war.

We have reached a point when even the elemental truths necessary as the foundations of the material sciences are undermined—since they, too, are subjected to the tyranny of the irrational will. Yet "out of the depths" the hearts and minds of men still cry in hunger for the lost Truth which is needed to make real the vision of human comradeship, of brotherhood and selfless collaboration of which Communism and Socialism are secular perversions—the vision which seemed, for a moment, to come very near for many when they drew close to their human brethren under the shadow of imminent death in the recent war.

For whether men know their God or not, whether they deny Him or not, they are His creatures, who can have no love-life except by giving themselves to His loving service. And the very leaders of the secular state are being brought, step by step, to see that the organization of the world's peace makes it necessary to re-establish the basis of Natural Law: a law above human wills, even the fictional "will of the people." The new universal human authority itself must be submissive if it is not to be a devouring monster feeding on the tree of human life. It must submit to a Justice not made by it or alterable by it—a Justice Whose source is in the design of

a transcendent God for the humanity He made for Himself.

It is urgent, therefore, that every Christian—and, above all, every Catholic—should realize his responsibility and mission in the present hour; *first*, towards our Western civilization which is dying, at the topmost peak of its material achievement, because the spirit of life in it has been eaten away by its apostasy from God; and *secondly*, towards the new “world society” which the West has created by its scientific achievement and economic expansion.

This society is as yet a formless pandemonium in which only the destroying forces seem to be active: it has no principle of order or spiritual power to give it unity. The economists and politicians find themselves incapable of exorcising the demonic forces which have been loosed by Western secular negation. *Religion* is the only power that can do this: so that the hope of the world rests on the spiritual nucleus of believers who bear the seed of that unity to which all men and human societies are called, under the sovereignty of the

God Who became Man for the salvation of our race.

His “mystery of love” is the answer to the “mystery of lawlessness” at work in the world. The new paganism we have to face today is more terrible than the older pagan savagery of Roman or barbarian in the tremendous power of its science of spiritual destruction: but it is not unconquerable, for it is a blind, dark power at odds with the deepest instincts in human nature. It can be defeated, as the older enemies of Christ’s Reign were over-thrown—by the “total” Christianity of faithful men and women in whom the power of the Spirit has become a world-renewing fire of life and love.

The worse the position, the higher the waves of death rise around us, the more need there is of courageous confidence and loyalty to Christ Our Companion and King, Who is Lord of both winds and waves: the more zealously we must fight that *His Kingdom may come, His Will be done, on earth, as it is in Heaven.*—THE ADVOCATE, Melbourne, Australia, Oct. 27, 1949.



“Whatever the weakness of the West, it still has one saving glory—the Church is free and the university is free. Truth can still be sought in our part of the world and God can still be loved and proclaimed in joy and freedom.”—Archbishop Cushing to the Newman Club Federation Convention, Cleveland, Ohio, June 15, 1950.

Documentation

Production for Human Needs

POPE PIUS XII

Address of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, prepared for the delegates to the Catholic International Congresses for Social Study (Fribourg Union) and Social Action (Saint Gall Union) held at Rome during Whitsuntide, June 3, 1950.

WE BID you a cordial welcome, members of the International Congress of Social Studies and of the International Christian Social Union, and feel particularly pleased to extend this greeting to you here during Holy Year. This meeting is more than a happy coincidence. On your part it is a manifestation of your personal dispositions. For us it offers grounds for a gratifying hope that your deliberations and your resolutions will contribute in large measure to the ripening of the fine fruit We are counting upon from this year of Return and of world-wide Reconciliation, namely, the renewal and expansion, within the great community of mankind, of the spirit of justice, brotherhood and peace.

The lack or decay of this spirit must, indeed, be regarded as one of the chief causes of the distress which afflicts millions of men in modern society—the vast multitude of unfortunates who are starving, or threatened with starvation, from unemployment. It is on their misery and discouragement that the spirit of evil is gambling in his attempt to wean them away from Christ, the real and only Saviour, to thrust them into the current of atheism and materialism and to entangle them in the mechanism of social organizations at variance with

the order established by God. Dazzled by the blinding light of handsome promises, by the impudent claim to successes which cannot be realized, they are sorely tempted to surrender to easy illusions which can only lead them to new and frightful social upheavals. What an awakening faces them when reality dissipates these beautiful, gilded dreams!

Only the coalition of all honest people in every part of the world, united in loyal understanding and perfect accord, for a far-reaching plan of action can bring about the remedy. Let there be no more of these blinkers that narrow the field of vision and reduce the vast problem of unemployment to a simple attempt at better distribution of the total individual and physical labor forces in the world!

The time has come to face squarely, in its full dimensions, the duty of providing for countless families, in their natural, moral, juridical and economic unity, a just living-space which meets, however modestly but at the very least in sufficient measure, the demands of human dignity.

Away with the selfish preoccupations of nationality and class which may in the least degree hinder an undertaking loyally embraced and vigorously car-

ried out by the joint action of all the forces actually at work or available over the whole face of the earth: an undertaking launched with the aid of every initiative and effort of private individuals and specialized groups, and with the world-wide collaboration of peoples and States, each contributing its respective share of wealth in raw materials, in capital, in manpower. All the participants in this common project should appreciate, finally, the assistance offered to it by the Church.

There you have the great social problem, with its challenge at the cross-roads in this present hour! If that problem is put on the way to a successful solution, even at the expense of material interests, even at the price of sacrifices by every member of the great human family, the international situation will be rid of one of its most troubling factors, the one which more than any other keeps alive today the ruinous "cold war," and threatens to set ablaze the incomparably more disastrous hot war, the war that burns.

A dweller in the old industrial countries would show himself very much behind the times were he to imagine that there is question today, as was the case a century or even only half a century ago, merely of assuring to the wage-earner, loosed from his feudal or patriarchal bonds, freedom in fact in addition to freedom by law. Such a notion would betray a complete failure to grasp the main issue in the present situation. For several decades now, in the majority of these countries and often under the decisive influence of the Catholic social movement, social policy has been taking the form of a progressive evolution in labor legislation, with a corresponding subjection of the private owner of the means of production to juridical obligations in favor of the workingman. The desire to see so-

cial policy further developed along these lines encounters a limit, and that limit is reached where the danger arises that the working-class may follow in its turn the mistaken course of capital. That course involved the withdrawing of personal responsibility, chiefly in big business, from the private owner (individual or partnership) and handing it over to the responsibility of anonymous corporate groups.

Such a development would suit a Socialist mentality to perfection. It could not but prove disturbing to anyone who is aware of the fundamental importance of the right to private property in stimulating initiative and fixing responsibility in economic matters.

A similar danger is likewise present when it is claimed that the wage-earners in a given industry have the right to economic joint-management, notably when the exercise of this right rests in reality, directly or indirectly, with organizations managed from outside the establishment.

WORKER AND EMPLOYER

As a matter of fact, neither the nature of the labor contract nor the nature of the business enterprise in themselves admit necessarily of a right of this sort. It is unquestionable that the wage-earner and the employer are equally the subjects, not the objects, of a nation's economy. There is no question of denying this parity. It is already an established principle of social policy; it would be asserted still more effectively were that policy to be organized on the occupational level. But there is nothing in the private-law relationship, as governed by the simple wage-contract, to contradict this fundamental parity. The wisdom of Our Predecessor Pius XI has made that quite clear in the Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*, where he denies, in consequence, that

there is any need in the nature of things to pattern the wage-contract on the contract of partnership. That is not to disavow the usefulness of what has thus far been achieved in this direction, "in various ways, to the no small gain of both wage-earners and employers" (*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, vol. 23, p. 199).¹ But in the light of principles and facts the right of economic joint-management lies beyond the field of these possible achievements.

The disadvantage of these problems lies in the fact that they make one lose sight of the problem of major importance and major urgency which broods like a nightmare especially over the old industrial countries, that is, the imminent and permanent menace of unemployment, the problem of the reintegration and maintenance of normal productive enterprise, of that productivity which is intimately linked, by its origin as well as in its purpose, to the dignity and well-being of the family viewed as a moral, juridical and economic unit.

With reference to the countries for which industrialization is being contemplated today, We cannot but applaud the efforts of ecclesiastical authorities designed to spare peoples who have been living up to now under a patriarchal or even feudal regime, those above all who dwell in towns made up of dissimilar groups, a repetition of the grievous omissions of economic liberalism during the last century. A social policy in harmony with the teaching of the Church, sustained by organizations which safeguard the material and spiritual interests of the people, and adapted to modern conditions, should be assured of the support of every genuine Catholic without exception.

Even supposing these new industri-

alizations to be a fact, the problem remains in its entirety. In their regard the same question recurs: do they contribute, yes or no, to the reintegration and maintenance of wholesome productive enterprise within the national economy? Or do they merely add further to the number of industries forever at the mercy of new crises? And besides, what care will be taken to develop and consolidate the domestic market—once it is rendered productive by reason of the size of the population and its manifold needs—where capital investment is guided only by the lure of transient advantages, and where empty illusions of national prestige determine economic decisions?

PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION

There has been too much experimenting with mass production, with the exploitation, to the point of exhaustion, of every resource of the soil and subsoil. Above all, peasant populations and agrarian economies have been only too cruelly sacrificed to these experiments. Equally blind is the well-nigh superstitious reliance on the mechanism of the world market to restore a balanced economy, and the trust in an Omniprovident State to secure, for each of its subjects and in every emergency of their lives, the right to make demands which must eventually prove to be unattainable.

In the domain of social economy the duty pressing for attention is the judicious adjustment of production to consumption on the basis of human needs and human dignity. In view of this urgency, the question which comes to the fore today is that of the organization and equipment of the social economy at its production-stage. The

¹ See *Reconstructing the Social Order* (*Encycl. Quadragesimo Anno*) America Press, 1948, p. 23.

solution of this question must not be sought from the theory of "laws of the market"—a purely positivistic by-product of neo-Kantian criticism—nor in the mere formula, every bit as artificial, of "full employment." There before you is the problem on which We should like to see the theorists and practical men of the Catholic social movement

concentrate their attention and bring their studies to bear.

In token of the paternal interest We take in your research and in your activities, under the patronage of the Holy Ghost, Whom We implore to fill your hearts with His Gifts, We impart to you and to all Catholic sociologists . . . our Apostolic Blessing.

Vocation of Businessmen

POPE PIUS XII

Address of His Holiness to the delegates of the World Congress of Chambers of Commerce, April 27, 1950.

WE HAVE a great joy in receiving you here, representatives of the Chambers of Commerce from all over the world: you who, in effect, represent the élite of the commercial world. We do not want to miss this occasion to tell you—in haste and in measure permitted by the extraordinary obligations of the Holy Year—a word of the Christian conception of your profession. Its role, its influence, its responsibilities are, in the present hour, of an importance and a gravity greater than ever. We believe it to be opportune that you crown your technical and juridical work by a serious moral consideration of the role and responsibilities of commerce.

It is not without impressive significance that mythology gave wings to Mercury (pagan god of commerce). Should we not see in that the symbol of the liberty that commerce needs to go and come across the borders of its own country? Certainly there is no question—and none among you dreams that there is—of claiming unlimited liberty, incompatible with the aims and needs of each national economy, or with the permanent solicitude for material prosperity of all. But on the contrary, it is in view of this (national) prosperity that you aspire to a fuller liberty of commerce. And you have reason.

It is not enough, unfortunately, to have reason on your side in the serene region of principles, so long as the most legitimate desires remain unrealizable in practice because of purely political considerations that continue to restrict the circulation and communication of persons and goods.

There are even countries where a policy has been adopted, more or less absolute, that places all commerce in the hands of public authority. Let us affirm this clearly: this is a tendency in opposition to the Christian conception of social economy. Commerce is fundamentally an activity of the individual and it is this private activity that gives a man his first impulse and lights the flame of his enthusiasm.

Further, you will not obtain the goal you wish, which is the general prosperity, without putting into full effect the individual exercise of commerce for the service of society's material well-being. The merchant, one will say, should be skilled without doubt; he must be a man of affairs, prudent more than sentimental, again, without doubt. But he must add to these strictly professional qualities a high concept of the ideal of his profession. As a businessman, he must also consider himself a servant of the community.

To have no other ambition except always to make more money and to enrich himself, is to betray his vocation, since one can well call by this name (vocation) the mission that God has assigned to him, the particularly difficult calling of a merchant.

He would thus play the game of the evil-minded, who strive to make of commerce a living vampire at the expense of all economic life. If, on the contrary, the merchant aims and strives to circulate worldly goods, destined by God for the advantage of all, and takes them where they must serve and in a manner to make them serve well—then, indeed, he is a good and true servant of society, a guarantee against misery, a promoter of general prosperity.

May, among other things, the concentration of commerce in the Chambers of Commerce and, perhaps one day, the constitution of these as representatives of all those linked with this profession, help maintain everywhere in its purity the ideal of the honest and, as is sometimes said, of the royally magnificent merchant.

But it is most important—because it is the solid basis of everything—that this ideal bears the imprint of religion. Did not our Lord Himself compare the Kingdom of Heaven to the precious gem that the wise merchant buys at the price of all his goods (*Matthew 13, 45*)? May this be the conviction of all of you; transmit it to your children, spread it among the young in your profession. Thus, you will bring upon yourselves, upon the good and healthy progress of your affairs and the whole world the most abundant divine favors, in pledge of which whole-heartedly We give you, your families and those that you represent here our Apostolic Benediction.

Patron of Teachers

Brief of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, proclaiming St. John Baptist de la Salle the Patron Saint of all teachers and student teachers.

THE saying of St. Bonaventure that "the only true educator is one who can kindle in the heart of his pupil the vision of beauty, illumine it with the light of truth and infuse virtue" is particularly apposite at the present time when the education of the young is not only frequently at variance with the principles of true moral training but is often godless and irreligious and harmful in the extreme. For this reason Holy Mother Church cherishes with a solicitous affection those whose duty it is to educate children, all the more so as the welfare and development of the Christian community depend on them in no small measure.

A man of outstanding holiness and remarkable genius, John Baptist de la Salle educated the young and continues to do so through the Society he founded. Moreover, to train teachers for their important mission he established colleges which catered especially to the preparation of village school teachers. The origin of training colleges for teachers, now found everywhere, must truly be attributed to him.

So great was the esteem of this eminent pioneer in education for the office of teacher that he would not permit the Brothers founded by him to become priests lest they should be turned aside from their principal function, and he was convinced that their vocation could lead them to truly great sanctity.

In order, therefore, that teachers and student teachers might have a model whose example and virtues they could imitate, the Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools, through their Postulator General, asked us that on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the canonization of St. John Baptist de la Salle by our predecessor of esteemed memory, Leo XIII, this saint should be proclaimed heavenly patron of all teachers of both sexes, clerical and lay, whether actually engaged in teaching or preparing for the profession.

We, for our part, convinced that the education of the young is of the first importance and desirous that those to whom this task is entrusted or who are preparing for this mission should have a more powerful incentive to fulfill their exalted vocation in accordance with the principles of the faith, most willingly accede to their wish.

Wherefore, having consulted our Venerable Brother, Clemente Micara, Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, Bishop of Velletri and Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and having attentively considered the matter, with sure knowledge and after mature deliberation, in the fullness of our apostolic authority, by virtue of this Brief and for all time, We constitute and proclaim St. John Baptist de la Salle, Confessor, principal patron before God of all teachers of youth and accord him all the liturgical honors and privileges going with that title, all things to the contrary notwithstanding.

Given at Rome, from St. Peter's and sealed with the Fisherman's ring, the 15th day of May, Feast of St. John Baptist de la Salle, in the twelfth year of our Pontificate.

THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: Robert C. Hartnett

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph C. Mulhern

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.